HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW
VOLUME LII JULY, 1959 NUMBER 3

THE GREEK IDEAS OF IMMORTALITY

THE INGERSOLL LECTURE FOR 1958

WERNER JAEGER
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

THE Immortality of Man was one of the fundamental creeds of the philosophical religion of Platonism that was in part adopted by the Christian church and that thus became one of the foundations of the Christian civilization of the Eastern and Western world. Ever since Paul in the 15th chapter of I Corinthians made resurrection the cornerstone of the Christian faith the Church has had a profound interest in the ancient philosophers who taught that man's soul is immortal and does not perish along with its mortal companion the body. Although this belief in the immortality of the soul, the ψυχή, is not the same as the Christian idea of man's resurrection in the flesh or in a transfigured body, both religious ideas have a natural affinity with each other; and it is therefore easy to understand that the Platonic belief in immortality was regarded as an anticipation of the Christian resurrection and helpful to the faithful who might wish to check their emotional expectations of a future life after death by rational reflection. Thus we find attempts to compare both things or to look for natural phenomena that could be interpreted as analogies of resurrection in nature. In his letter to the Corinthians Clement of Rome referred to the mythical bird Phoenix, which is reborn and rises from the ashes periodically, and he thereby created a symbol that has proved unbelievably fruitful in the millennial tradition of Christian poetry and religious thought. It took some time for the Christian authors of the ancient period to distinguish sharply between the pagan concept of immortality and the Christian idea of resurrection, and some of them contaminated the two unhesitatingly. In Gregory of Nyssa's famous dialogue De anima et resurrectione, written after the death of his sister Saint Macrina

and recording his last conversation with her before she died, we find this typical fusion of pagan and Christian ideas expressed in the very title of the book, which contains them both.

In some of the previous Ingersoll Lectures I have found references to a different kind of immortality than the survival of the human person after death. Such are man's physical survival in his offspring, or his social survival in the honor shown him by the community in keeping his name and memory alive after his death. This form of belief was by some of the lecturers regarded as a kind of modern substitute or *Ersatz* for the genuine belief in personal immortality, and they therefore dismissed it from serious consideration. Since we are concerned today with the special forms the idea of immortality took among the ancient Greeks, we must observe that it is exactly this approach to the problem of life and death that is found originally in Greek tradition, whereas belief in the immortality of the soul is a later product of the Greek mind. It cannot be separated from the development of the idea of the soul, which is itself an important stage in the history of Greek thought and should not be taken for granted. It is one thing to be a Christian who believes in resurrection and to look back upon this later stage of Greek culture in order to find confirmation of my faith in Plato or other pagan philosophers; and it is quite another thing to be a historian of the Greek mind who tries to grasp the rhythm of its evolution and present it in its various stages, including its final merger with the Christian religion. Since the latter is my natural methodical approach to the problem, I hope you will permit me to start with the earlier phase, which we find reflected in the oldest Greek poetry, Homer and his successors, and ascend from there to the ideas of a later spiritual philosophy of the human soul, Plato and his followers.

In the early poetic tradition there is a sharp cleavage between men and gods. Men are called mortals, and it is the distinctive mark of the gods that they are immortal. The specific words for man (ἀνήρ or ἄνθρωπος) are used mostly in contrast to the gods. Indeed, we look in vain in the Homeric epics, the Iliad and the Odyssey, for the view that men survive their bodies. The Trojan war sent to Hades the ψυχαί of many heroes, whereas "they themselves" were thrown to dogs and birds of prey. "They themselves"

means their bodies; thus some modern interpreters have concluded that the ψυχή that goes to the underworld must be something like the soul, especially since "soul" is the later meaning of the word ψυχή. But Homer describes the ψυχαί of the dead as mere shadows without conscious life or mental activity. They lost all memory of life when they crossed the stream of Lethe, the river of forgetfulness. Homer calls them "idols," a kind of ghosts, resembling their former shape and face, but there is no passage in Homer where ψυχή is used of a living man and means what we call a soul. For that he uses other words, which are mostly taken from parts of the body such as the heart or the diaphragm, or from affections of the body such as the heat of anger (θυμός, Latin *fumus*). The ψυχή leaves the body with the last breath; originally, therefore, the word ψυχή, which comes from ψύχειν (to breathe), must have had something to do with the breath of life, just like the Latin *anima* and *animus*, which are etymologically related to the Greek word for wind, ἄνεμος; but in Homer ψυχή is no longer the breath and even less the conscious soul with all its functions. The only thing that survives a man's physical existence is his name, which is kept alive by his fame. This seems to make it certain that there was a difference between the great mass of mortals who had nothing to hope for after death and the valiant and noble warriors who left behind them the glorious memory of their deeds to live on in the songs of the ἀοιδοί. In these songs the great deeds of gods and men were equally praised; the difference between mortals and immortals seemed almost to disappear, and man acquired eternal glory and reputation. His personality was strong enough to resist the common law of oblivion. Professor Clark said something similar about the Indian religion, and Kittredge described that of the old Germanic tribes in colors that remind one of the Greeks in their heroic age. But Homer knows no Walhall. Poetry is man's immortality, as it were, for it is essentially praise, as Homer, Hesiod, and their successors tell us explicitly; and the strongest motive for the greatest heroic effort of an individual is that it will make him survive in song so as to be known to future generations (καὶ ἐσσομένοισι πυθέσθαι).

The first time that we are told expressly that a man will become "immortal" (ἀθάνατος) is therefore quite logically in martial

poetry. This is in one of the few elegies preserved of the Spartan Tyrtaeus (7th century), who promises this as their future lot to the valiant warriors who have died for their country. The new thing here is that the country, the community of the polis, takes over, as it were, the function of the Homeric singer who praises the virtue of his heroes. In the new phase of Greek life embodied in the city or polis, the community guarantees eternal memory to those who have given their lives for it. Tyrtaeus says: the hero, although he is under the earth, nevertheless becomes immortal. In other words, where the idea of immortality occurs for the first time it is meant as a great paradox. In the cult religion of the Greek city the heroes of old who are interred in the tombs, the θῆκαι, are always mentioned along with the upper gods (θεοὶ ὕπατοι), and the new heroes who have died in battle enjoy similar honors: they receive public burial and a tomb revered by all, young and old, and their name survives both in the memory of the living community and in the songs of men at their symposia. The individual is socialized as a member of the polis, but, in an ideal sense, he maintains and forever preserves his individuality by giving up his life to the community. It is not accidental that the question of his immortality is raised at this moment. Obviously this belief in his immortality is more than a poetic metaphor, for it assures him of the imperishable value of his personality, which is invested in his name and fame. There is one great difference between this idea of glory, which I would like to call its political form, and the glory of the Homeric heroes; and that is that the *areté* of the individual citizen of a Greek polis is measured by its relation to the common good.

In a way this kind of immortality, which appears so natural in the early Greek community of the polis, never died as long as the Greek polis was alive. It is still invoked by the orators of the Athenian democracy of the 5th and 4th centuries in their patriotic funeral speeches delivered at the graves of the soldiers who have died in the great wars for the liberty of the land, such as Pericles' funeral oration or that in Plato's Menexenus. It is the polis of Athens that bestows immortality on them, and they need no Homer. In Plato's Symposium we notice a characteristic change: the warrior is no longer the only one who is entitled to this im-

mortality. Other men of fame share his honor: the lawgiver, the poet, the writer, the scientist, and the philosopher. But they have this in common with the old warrior immortality, that they are immortalized by what they have achieved for the whole human community, not by their mere talent or genius. They are animated by an insatiable erōs, like the physical erōs that impels ordinary mortals to propagate their own person and life in their offspring: in the same way the great creative men of humanity are filled with a hunger and thirst for achieving immortality by virtue of imperishable works. The physical and the spiritual erōs spring from the same root, though they try to achieve their objective on different levels. Thus we see the idea of immortality take a more and more important place in the human consciousness of the 4th century B.C.; but even though the idea of the political community and the common good is still the value to which every form of human activity is related and which determines a person's value, it seems evident that this original authority of the social order is vanishing in real life and that the highly differentiated individual of this century is struggling hard to maintain a value of his own that is independent of the great mass of men because it is rooted in something of eternal validity and in the depth of the human soul. We therefore expect, at this point of historical evolution, to encounter a new conception of immortality, the immortality of the soul. Indeed, the same Plato who interprets the creative effort of the human mind as the innate metaphysical erōs for immortal life, takes the step of declaring the soul itself immortal.

But where does this concept of soul have its origin in the history of the Greek mind, since we did not find any trace of it in Homer or in the earlier writers? Plato certainly did not create it single-handed; it had a previous development of its own, which, so far as we can trace it, takes us back to the 6th century B.C. In this period of social revolution and intellectual upheaval there is more than one group that seems to have contributed to the new conception of man's internal life and nature. The Orphic religion, the Pythagorean ideal of an ascetic life, and the religion of the so-called mysteries have this in common as against the cult religion of the great mass of the people, that they are concerned with man's inner life, however material its symbolic representation. They all

think of man as being much closer to the divine than was commonly assumed, even as being himself of divine origin. In these circles we find for the first time the belief in the soul of man as something different and separable from the body. Unfortunately we know very little of these sects or of the cult of the mysteries, which were kept secret by the members, and we must therefore try to form an idea of them from sources that are considerably later than the 6th century. The Orphic religion, the origin of which was attributed to the mythical person of Orpheus, the singer, was a βίος or way of life to keep the soul pure and immaculate during its habitation in the body, in order to enable it to return to its divine home after death. Some speak of the body as the soul's prison or tomb — σῶμα σῆμα, as the old formula quoted by Plato has it. Pindar, who encountered the Orphic religion in Sicily, in his second Olympian ode describes the religious faith of its followers and their expectation of a life after death: "Day and night the sun shines for the guiltless in the world beyond, they do not disquiet the earth with the strength of their hands, neither the water of the sea, but among the honored gods they enjoy a life without tears; while the wicked suffer pain the sight of which none can bear; but those who have kept their soul free from unjust deeds and have maintained an innocent state for the space of three lifetimes both here and beyond, they will walk the path of Zeus to Kronos' tower. There the ocean-breezes sweep across the Island of the Blessed. Flowers of gold flame from the radiant trees on the mainland, while the water nourishes others, and with garlands of these the blessed decorate themselves. . . ." Here we have the concept of soul in a quite un-Homeric sense, not as a shadow or idol in Hades, but living through three lives in both worlds, here and beyond, and this soul is the real subject of man's inner life. More descriptions of the soul's blessed life in the world beyond are to be found in the preserved fragments of a Pindaric θρῆνος, i.e., lament for somebody's death; but more important than these colorful pictures of eternal bliss is what is said there about the nature of the soul itself. "The body of all men is subject to all-powerful death, but there still remains alive an image of man's life, for this alone comes from the gods. It sleeps when the limbs are active, but to those that sleep, it presages in many a dream

the decision of things delightful or doleful." Erwin Rohde, the author of the famous book Psyche, thought he should identify the εἴδωλον of this Pindaric passage with the Homeric idol in Hades; but the ghostlike ψυχή in Homer is never referred to while man is alive, but only when he dies or is dead in the sense of Pindar's description. More recent scholarship, however, has shown that we have here two entirely different conceptions of the ψυχή, the Homeric and the Orphic. The former is not a soul at all in our sense but a ghostlike shadow, whereas the Orphic conception presupposes not only a soul in the later sense of the word but its continuing existence, both while still imprisoned in the body and after its release from it. But it is not identical with the conscious life of man; we might call it the dream soul, because it is only in his dreams that man has any indication of its existence within himself. It is this independent existence of the dream soul inside us and its intensified activity in the face of death that makes Pindar (or the people whose faith he describes) believe in its continued existence after death. The idea of a migration of the soul, though not through beings other than human, is implied in Pindar's eschatology. On the other hand, this idea of soul is not based upon a physiological conclusion, but the soul becomes for the Orphic faith the hero of a moral drama that runs through three lives and ends either in its liberation and eternal rest among the gods or in eternal suffering — we would say, in Heaven or Hell. The idea of another Zeus who sits in judgment of the dead in Hades occurs also in Aeschylus' Suppliants, where it seems to be derived from Orphic sources.

Pindar is the 5th century poet who apparently was most fascinated by the eschatological myth of the Orphic religion, although Wilamowitz may be correct in saying that we have no right to conclude from his picture in the 2nd Olympian and in the Threnos that Pindar was a convert himself. We find another witness of that Orphic view in the epic poem of Empedocles of Agrigentum (middle of the 5th century), which bore the significant title Purifications. This same man also wrote a famous didactic poem on the nature of the universe in which he appears as a scientist and philosopher of nature thinking along the line of strict material causality. It has been a matter of speculation among scholars how

he was able to reconcile in himself both ways of thinking. Man belongs to both spheres of reality, the world of the ceaseless cycle of the physical elements, which attract each other by love and repel each other by hatred, and the world from which the soul of man arose before it was wrapped in the strange garment of flesh. It is of divine origin, and Empedocles calls it the daemon that dwells upon this earth in exile from God. It lives in all sorts of bodies through which it has to go on its endless migration. We shudder when we read a thought like this: "I too was once a boy and a girl, a bush and a mute fish rising from the depths of the sea." Empedocles seems to embrace all these forms of life with melancholy sympathy. His is the understanding love of one who feels their existence from within, and none of them is more remote from him than he is from himself. From the unspeakable bliss of its heavenly home the soul came down to the confinement of this cave, and he remembers the moment: "I wept and wailed when I caught sight of this unfamiliar place." So the immortality of the soul is linked by Empedocles with its pre-existence and transmigration into other beings. This does not separate him from other than human creatures but makes him feel a profound solidarity with them. Hence he adopts the Orphic vegetarianism and strictly forbids the killing of animals. Empedocles is a special case among the so-called pre-Socratic thinkers because of his Orphism, but the belief in the divinity of the soul remains a problem also for other contemporaries, such as Diogenes of Apollonia, who follows in the footsteps of the earlier philosophers of nature and derives everything from one primal ground, but explains by his basic principle, which is the air, the origin of body and soul alike. The soul that animates the body is called by him "a small part of God," for it is a modification of the divine Air and returns to its ethereal origin when it is separated from its body in death, whereas the material remains of the dead man return to earth. We see the problem of the soul's immortality here treated as a part of a pantheistic natural theology. This was the form in which it seems to have appealed to the sceptical mind of a Euripides, who reflects so often in his dramas the most enlightened thought of his time. The Orphic faith and the Dionysus mysteries also appear in his Hippolytus and in his Bacchae, but they interest him more as psychopathologi-

cal phenomena. Nevertheless they are symptoms of a new approach to reality, of which Plato is our main witness: the immaterial world, which is his discovery, is the world of the soul, and it is the very center of Plato's thought.

There can be little doubt that Plato did not inherit his belief in the immortality of the soul from his master Socrates. In his Apology of Socrates we find a very reserved attitude towards the question of man's survival. Socrates considers it as perfectly possible that death is the end of man's existence. The opposite possibility, too, is discussed, and Socrates ironically anticipates the pleasure of this chance of continuing in the world beyond his favorite activity of questioning people, for which he was sentenced to death in this. But his "care for the soul," of which he speaks so frequently as his god-sent task, makes the soul appear as the greatest value in human life, its *areté* as man's only source of true happiness. We witness in Plato's Socratic dialogues the birth of a new religion. Philosophy is for him a way of life that leads to the salvation (σωτηρία) of the soul. In the Phaedo this faith stands the test in the hour of Socrates' death. Master and disciples are talking in the prison about the soul, its nature and destiny. Plato has arrived at the conviction that the soul is indestructible, and he lends this faith to the dying Socrates, since this unshakable confidence is the root of his life. His triumph over injustice is as complete as his victory over "fear and trembling." The scene is surrounded by peace and serenity. In this supreme hour the soul is preparing to separate itself from the body and the material world, as far as this can be done while it is still in the flesh, and it turns to the world of being that is the home of the philosopher.

Plato's conception of the soul is the crown of his philosophy of knowledge, and it could not have taken such definite shape without his theory of ideas. If we understand him correctly, this is what he tells us himself in his Phaedo, where he declares that the belief in the immortality of the soul stands or falls with this theory. The more he came to visualize the ideas as the only true being beyond the world of sense-perception, which Heraclitus had in mind when he said that everything is in perpetual flux, the more Plato was led to believe that the knowledge of the ideas, which springs from the soul itself and not from our senses, exists

in the soul because it remembers what it once knew in a former life. This way of thinking was suggested to him not by Socrates but by the old Orphic myth about the origin and migration of the soul through several lives, and he expressly mentions the old formula σῶμα σῆμα, which for him takes on a new meaning. The way in which he makes use of various elements of Orphic eschatology in his myths about the destiny of the soul after death at the end of his Gorgias, Phaedo, and Republic proves unmistakably that he found truth in them if taken in a nonliteral sense. Of course the adept of the Orphic religion took these myths quite literally, but for Plato they have a different function: they present in mythical form a truth that Plato has tried to arrive at by way of dialectical inquiry. Nothing could be more wrong than to make Plato an Orphic, as some historians of religion and especially some students of Orphism in ancient Greece, such as Machioro, have tried to do, thereby making the problem simply one of good old-fashioned *Quellenforschung*. One might as well contend that Goethe became a Catholic at the end of the second part of Faust, since he there makes use of elements of Catholic religious symbolism for his poetic vision of Heaven. Greek philosophers often did this in order to create for themselves a philosophical language and a world of symbols analogous to those of religion, most of all Plato, who is great at this art. It is only natural that such symbolic analogies should not as a rule have been borrowed from the cult religion of the people but almost exclusively from the religion of the mystery cults or the Orphic sect, first, because theirs was a form of religion that consisted of symbolism, and second, because it was concerned with the individual man's salvation and hope for a better life after death. But the path leading to the happiness of the philosophical soul was different from that of the initiates of the Orphic sect. Their purification was through abstinence from certain things such as the flesh of animals or through a prescribed ritual; but the κάθαρσις of which we read in Plato's Phaedo is effected through the gradual ascent of the soul to the world of being by the long and toilsome way of knowledge. The Symposium gives an even more detailed picture of this ascent through knowledge, comparing it to the initiation in the successive stages of the mysteries. The soul thereby becomes more and more similar

to the object of its knowledge, and only by this process of gradual assimilation to pure being and to the divine good can the knowledge of it finally be attained. Plato's language, his symbols, and his thoughts about the soul and its cosmic destiny are taken from the ancient theologians and not from the pre-Socratic physiologists and cosmologists, but throughout he gives them, with sovereign poetic liberty, a sublimized philosophical meaning.

Plato returns to the problem of the soul again and again in his dialogues. In the Phaedo, the Phaedrus, the Laws we find proofs of the immortality of the soul, whereas in the Timaeus, Plato's great cosmogonic myth, we take a new look at the problem because the philosopher there dwells at length on the creation of the soul in his mythical story of the *ψυχογονία*. This part distinguishes Plato's cosmogony more than anything else from the cosmogonies of earlier Greek thinkers: when he late in life writes his own story of the origin of the universe, the most important point of difference from his predecessors is exactly this, that the existence of souls in it has become the central problem; and since the soul is for Plato the principle of all motion and is prior to the body, Plato's whole cosmogony is constructed around the idea of a world-soul. If Plato uses motives of ancient Greek theology throughout, it is obvious that they offer him the material for a completely new theology, which we see take shape in his later works; but it is characteristic that in his outline of a theology in the Timaeus and the Laws the soul stands out as the basic fact. Two are the sources for the belief in God, he writes in book XII of his Laws: the eternal ordered movement of the stars and the spontaneous and inexhaustible, ever-flowing life of the soul.

We have traced Plato's philosophy of the soul through its various phases and found it to be the principle of all life and movement in the universe. The short time at our disposal does not permit us to discuss in detail the various so-called proofs of the immortality of the soul given in the Phaedo, the Republic, and the Phaedrus, nor do I think that it would be profitable to do so without taking into account the full context of Plato's philosophy of being and knowledge. If in these proofs Plato seems to make the issue depend on logical subtleties, the great soul myths speak an unmistakable language; for they show clearly that Plato is aware

of his trespassing the limits of rational thought and that he feels that the mythopoetic presentation of the issue is the only appropriate approach. Like a philosophical Michelangelo, he puts before the eyes of humanity in symbolic frescoes of unspeakable grandeur the divine origin of the soul, its journey to this world of the senses, its longing for the other world of true being, and its return from exile to its home after due purification by philosophy. The Hebrew Bible does not know immortality in this sense at all, and the idea of resurrection in the New Testament is quite different. If nevertheless Plato's ideas of the soul and its destiny seem so familiar to us and have kept their direct appeal, that is because they have been adopted, with inevitable modifications, by the fathers of the church. If they dogmatized this part of Plato's philosophy of the soul, whereas in Plato himself everything remains *in suspenso*, they have this in common with the Neoplatonists, who brought it all into the form of a theological system. The Christian fathers rejected the story of the transmigration of the soul, but they accepted the immortality of the individual soul, since they found it reconcilable with Paul's notion of the resurrection and with Jewish-Christian angelology, i.e., the existence of a world of immaterial beings. The most important fact in the history of Christian doctrine was that the father of Christian theology, Origen, was a Platonic philosopher at the school of Alexandria. He built into Christian doctrine the whole cosmic drama of the soul, which he took from Plato, and although later Christian fathers decided that he took over too much, that which they kept was still the essence of Plato's philosophy of the soul. It was for them as it was for Plato the significant expression of their basic spiritualism and immaterialism. Socrates' message to the world presupposes a radical transvaluation of reality — so Callicles, the strong man in Plato's Gorgias, tells Socrates — and he is right. It meant the greatest revolution in human thought that had ever occurred, and the man who lived this faith and died for it had both his feet on the ground, though in a world other than that of his fellow Athenians. Standing firmly on this ground, he was strong enough to counterbalance the weight of the entire visible world and normal life. Socrates is invulnerable by the imperfection of human justice, by the majority vote of common sense, and by the

logic of both scientific and unscientific materialism. The human mind cannot reach the dimension to which the soul of man belongs by way of ordinary logic. Even though Plato makes repeated attempts to rationalize his faith, it is "in the form of myth" that he gives humanity the lasting symbol of his experience of ultimate reality. He became the creator of the new myth after the primitive myth of a bygone age had had its last great revival in Greek tragedy. The point around which Plato's new myth crystallized is the soul. At the very moment when the Greek mind seemed to arrive at the stage of its final *Entmythologisierung*, a super-myth arose and ushered in a new age of the world. It was in this atmosphere that the religion of Christianity was able to establish itself and so find the new justification for the great paradox of its own supramundane faith. It could happen only in a world that spoke Greek, as has often been said; but it did not depend on the language in the linguistic sense of the κοινή. It was possible in a world that spoke the spiritual language of Plato.

As we said in the first part of this lecture, the immortality of man consisted in his name and in the living memory of his deeds, as long as the individual was safe and protected as a part of the social community of his fellow citizens in the early Greek polis, even after his death. The belief in another kind of immortality, rooted in the very essence of his soul, sprang from a new age that was no longer so sure of man's self-fulfilment as a part of whatever state on earth. The order of being on which Plato's philosophical man depends is to be found in the polis of his own soul, and with the faith in the eternal and unshakable character of this invisible being the belief in the lasting nature of the soul itself emerged triumphantly from the ruins of the political cosmos of the early and classical Hellenic world. The scholastic problems that seemed to be implied in this assertion were promptly pointed out by later ancient thinkers, who mistook the reality of the soul as either true or as unreal in the sense of the facts of natural science. Kant called immortality and God "postulates" of human reason. Plato called them "the truly being," thereby devaluating the reality of our sense perception and granting a higher reality to man's essence as a moral and spiritual being.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE TWO MESSIAHS IN SECTARIAN LITERATURE IN THE TIME OF THE SECOND COMMONWEALTH *

J. LIVER
HEBREW UNIVERSITY, JERUSALEM

I

THE problem of the two Messiahs in Apocryphal literature, especially in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and in the Damascus Covenant, occupied scholars at the beginning of the present century and has revealed new facets with the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Especially pertinent to this problem are some of the texts from Qumran Cave 1, and some fragments from Qumran Cave 4, recently published. We shall here endeavor to make clear the distinctive features of these Messiahs, their status and their tasks at the end of days, and to elucidate the historical setting from which the doctrine of the two Messiahs sprang.

Scholars differ as to the time when the scrolls were composed, and they differ even more on the Pseudepigrapha. The greater difficulty in dating the latter is due to their archaizing character and the intentionally obscure way in which the various authors refer to the events of their own age. But there is considerable similarity in ideas, concepts and terminology between some of the Pseudepigrapha — the Ethiopic Enoch, The Book of Jubilees and the Testaments of the Patriarchs — and the Dead Sea Scrolls;[1] fragments from these books were found, together with sectarian writings proper, in the Qumran Caves.[2] We may therefore assume with great probability that, even if these books do not actually belong to the writings of the Qumran Sect, they originated in

* I wish to express my thanks to Dr. D. Flusser, Dr. J. Licht, Mr. S. Safrai and Mr. M. Stern, all of the Hebrew University, who have read the manuscript and given me their advice.

[1] Cf. J. M. Grintz, Sinai 32, 1953, pp. 11 ff., 27 ff. (Hebrew); R. Marcus, The Qumran Scrolls and Early Judaism, Biblical Research, 1, 1952, pp. 12–17.

[2] Cf. Barthélemy — Milik, Qumran Cave 1, Oxford, 1955, pp. 46, 82–91; J. T. Milik, Le Testament de Levi en Araméen, RB, 62, 1955, pp. 398–406; and also RB, 63 (1956), pp. 49–67.

closely related circles [3] and were roughly contemporary with the Sect.

The period in which the Dead Sea Scrolls were composed can be determined from the historical hints contained in the Damascus Covenant [4] and the Sectarian Commentaries, especially the Nahum Commentary: these point quite clearly to the troubled days of Alexander Jannaeus.[5] We may therefore regard the reign of John Hyrcanus I, which preceded his, as the period in which the Sect already took shape and finally separated from the general body of the nation. In this essay I shall show that the historical and social background of the doctrine of the two Messiahs — one a priest and the other a prince or king — must be sought in the Qumran Sect and the Hasmonean period. The fact that we find this doctrine clearly stated in sectarian writings which have reached us in their original form also calls for a thorough examination of the problem of the two Messiahs in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.

II

From the scrolls so far published, we cannot decide whether the Qumran Sect hoped for a redeeming Messiah or not. However, in matters of salvation as in other respects, the stress in sectarian writings is on the Sect as a whole, which according to them is the only true Israel.[6] The individual — even the head of the community at the end of days — has no standing by himself. The high priest is senior in rank and office in the wars preceding the end of days,[7] as well as subsequently, according to most of the texts before us. On the other hand the prince or "Anointed of

[3] Cf. D. Flusser, The Apocryphal Book of Ascensis Isaiae and the Dead Sea Sect, IEJ, 3, 1953, pp. 30 f.

[4] Fragments of the Damascus Covenant were also found among the scrolls in the Qumran Caves. Cf. RB, 63, 1956, p. 61; M. Baillet, ibid., pp. 513–523.

[5] Cf. M. H. Segal, The Habakkuk Commentary and the Damascus Fragments (A Historical Study), JBL, 70, 1951, pp. 131 ff.; J. M. Allegro, Further Light on the History of the Qumran Sect, ibid., 75, 1956, pp. 89 ff.; J. T. Milik, Dix ans de découvertes dans le désert de Juda, Paris, 1957, pp. 51 ff., 103 ff.; F. M. Cross, Ancient Library of Qumran, New York, 1958, pp. 82 ff.

[6] Cf. D. Flusser, The Judean Desert Sect and its Views, Zion, 19, 1954, pp. 89–103 (Hebrew).

[7] Y. Yadin, The War of the Sons of Light with the Sons of Darkness, Jerusalem, 1955, pp. 189 ff. (Hebrew).

Israel" mentioned in these texts is lesser in degree than the high priest, also called most probably "[the priest][8] head of the congregation of Israel" (1Q 28a, col. II, 12). The precedence of the high priest over the Anointed of Israel at the end of days is evident from the description of the "session of the men of repute called for the council of the community," which is stated in the Rule for the Congregation of Israel at the end of days.[9] According to this description first in the council of the community shall come the priest, head of the congregation of Israel, all the elders of the sons of Aaron, the priests, each according to his rank, shall sit before him; only after them shall come the Anointed One of Israel and all the heads of the families of Israel, each according to his rank (1Q 28a, col. II, 11–17). In the same way, the priest takes precedence over the Anointed of Israel at table (1Q 28a, col. II, 17–21), and this rule is to obtain at all meals where there are ten or more men present (1Q 28a, col. II, 21–22).

The description of the "session of the men of repute" is founded on the "Rule for the session of the many" which expounds the regulations then in force in the Sect. In this passage, it is stated: "The priests shall sit first, and the elders second, and the rest of the people shall sit each according to his position" (1QS VI, 8–9). The regulations of the Sect also forbid members to begin the communal meal before the priest blesses the bread and wine (1QS VI, 4–5; cf. also B. Gittin 59b). These regulations and others indicate the superior position of the priests in the Sect. The description of the "session of the men of repute" in the Rule of the Congregation (1Q 28a) is not a mere repetition of these regulations. It is intended to indicate the superior position of the high priest, and also of the priests in general, at the end of days.

The messianic hope for two leaders, one from Aaron and one

[8] For a different reading cf. F. M. Cross, Qumran Cave 1, JBL, 75, 1956, pp. 124 f.

[9] Cf. Barthélemy — Milik, Qumran Cave 1, Oxford, 1955, pp. 107–118; also, K. G. Kuhn, Die beiden Messias Aarons und Israels, Theologische Literaturzeitung, 79, 1954, pp. 760–761; idem, The Two Messiahs of Aaron and Israel, in The Scrolls and the New Testament, New York, 1957, pp. 54–64, 256–259; K. Schubert, Zwei Messiasse aus dem Regelbuch von Chirbet Qumran, Judaica, 11, 1955, pp. 216–235; E. L. Ehrlich, Ein Beitrag zur Messiaslehre der Qumransekte, ZAW, 68, 1956, pp. 234–243; H. N. Richardson, Some Notes on 1QSa, JBL, 76, 1957, pp. 108–122; A. S. Van der Woude, Die Messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumran, Assen, 1957, pp. 96–106.

from Israel, who will arise after the end of the epoch of wickedness is expressed in a phrase which recurs in the writings of the Sect, "until the coming of a prophet and the anointed ones of Aaron and Israel" (1QS, IX, 11).[10] In the Damascus Covenant, however, we find the following: "until there shall arise the anointed one of Israel and Aaron" (CD, XII, 22; XIV, 19); "when there shall come the anointed one of Aaron and Israel" (CD, XIX, 11), but the version "anointed one" (משיח) in a medieval copy of the Damascus Covenant is merely a scribal error or an emendation of משיחי, as already pointed out by scholars. This is proved conclusively by the version given in the Manual of Discipline and by the detailed description in the Rule of the Congregation where, together with the priest, head of the congregation of Israel, the Anointed One of Israel is mentioned. The Messiahs of Aaron and Israel are mentioned once more in the Damascus Covenant in the text "until there shall rise an anointed one from Aaron and from Israel" (CD, XX, 1); this is just a shortened phrase meaning an anointed one from Aaron and an anointed one from Israel. A common element in all these passages referring to the anointed ones of Aaron and Israel is the fact that the time of their coming is regarded as the beginning of the end of days. The laws and regulations of the Sect are in force only until that time, and then too the end of the evildoers will come; that is to say, the time when the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel are to arise is equated with the end of days. This fact, moreover, confirms the identification of the anointed of Aaron mentioned in the Manual of Discipline with the priest, head of the congregation of Israel, mentioned together with the anointed of Israel in the Rule of the Congregation.

This identity of the anointed of Aaron and the high priest also emerges from the definition of "anointed" or "Messiah" in the early eschatological writings, the scrolls included. Here the term anointed (משיח) is not limited to the idea of a savior: it still contains the original meaning, "he who is anointed with the oil of unction," i.e., the king or the priest at the end of days. For

[10] Cf. N. Wieder, Journal of Jewish Studies, 4, 1943, p. 168, n. 2; and the detailed treatment by H. L. Silberman, The Two "Messiahs" of the Manual of Discipline, VT, 5, 1955, pp. 77–82; Van der Woude, ibid., pp. 27–43, 75–89.

according to rabbinical tradition the oil of unction was hidden away in the reign of Josiah [11] and there was none at the time of the Second Commonwealth. The Halakhah distinguishes between the anointed (high) priest — also called simply "the anointed" [12] (that is, the high priest when the oil of unction is finally restored at the end of days) — and the "priest with manifold garments" who is the high priest in the time of the Second Commonwealth. And although for all practical purposes the "priest with manifold garments" acted as the high priest, there exists in the law a distinction between the two, especially in the regulations dealing with expiatory sacrifice (Mishnah Horayoth). The expiation demanded of the anointed (high priest) is equal to that of the court — i.e., the public — while the prince (i.e., the king) [13] is in this case in the same category as a private person (M. Horayoth, ii:6). But in this matter, which indicates status in juridical decisions, the "priest of manifold garments" is inferior to the anointed high priest. This is expressly stated in the same Mishnaic tractate (iii:4):[14] "And who is the anointed (high priest)? He that is anointed with the oil of unction, but not he that is dedicated by the manifold garments. The (high) priest anointed with the oil of unction differs from the priest of manifold garments only in the bullock offered for (the unwitting transgression of) any of the commandments." In the Babylonian Talmud (Hor., 11b) this distinction in rank is stated in the most extreme terms: "If he is anointed he is the high priest; if he is not anointed he is not the high priest."

In Mishnaic law, only the anointed high priest has full authority, but in view of the absence of the oil of unction there can only be an anointed high priest at the end of days. This Halakhah comes from traditional Judaism, but as it does not in any way run counter to the principles of the Sect, we may reasonably assume that it prevailed among them.

[11] Cf. Tosefta Sotha xiii:1; Tosefta Yoma iii (ii), 7; B. Horayoth 12a; B. Yoma 52b; B. Kerithoth 5b; Yer. Sheqālim vi:1; Yer. Sotha viii:3.

[12] The term anointed (משיח) for an anointed High Priest is found many times in the Mishnah. Cf. Horayoth ii, passim; Tos. Shebouoth i, 6, etc.

[13] Cf. Mishnah Horayoth iii, 3 — "And who is the Prince (נשיא)? This is the King."

[14] Also, Mishnah Megillah i, 9; Tos. Megillah i, 19; etc.

The identity of the anointed of Aaron with the priestly head of the congregation at the end of days, which is proved by the contents of the sectarian writings, emerges from the precise definition of the term "Anointed of Aaron" (משיח מאהרון) by itself. The term "Anointed of Israel," on the contrary, does not differ from the more general term "anointed." The description of the session of the men of repute in the Rule of the Congregation, according to which the priests sit before the high priest, whereas the heads of the families of Israel sit before the Anointed of Israel, delimits the term in that it excludes the Anointed of Aaron. From this we may conclude that the Anointed of Israel is no less than the future anointed king.

The Anointed of Israel is mentioned in the writings of the Sect only in the expression "the anointed ones of Aaron and Israel" and in the description in the Rule of the Congregation. On the other hand, the Prince of the Congregation is mentioned in the scroll of the War of the Sons of Light (1QM V, 1–2); but he is mentioned only once — and even then not as a leader in war — in contrast to the high priest, who plays a central part in that scroll and is mentioned there many times.[15] In actual fact, only the shield of the Prince of the Congregation is mentioned, on which is written his name with the names of the twelve tribes of Israel and the names of the leaders of the tribes. This does not imply the active participation of the prince in the war, nor does it exclude it.

A benediction for the prince of the congregation is also found in the 1 Qumran Benedictions,[16] which were most probably destined for the end of days. The extant remains of these benedictions include blessings: for them that fear the Lord; the high priest; the priests sons of Zadok, and the Prince of the Congregation. Of the six columns which the benedictions probably comprised there remain only parts of five. The order of the columns is conjectural, but that of the four big fragments which comprise the bottom part of cols. III–V is almost certain,[17] and one of the fragments includes part of col. IV and part of col. V. So the placing

[15] Cf. Yadin, op. cit. (supra n. 7), pp. 189 ff.
[16] Cf. Milik, op. cit. (supra n. 9), pp. 118–130.
[17] Cf. ibid., p. 119.

of the benediction for the Prince of the Congregation after the benediction for the high priest and the benediction for the priests sons of Zadok is an established fact. From the contents of the blessing for the Prince of the Congregation we learn (col. V, 20–29) that the Prince of the Congregation is the future ruler who will inherit the kingdom of his people for ever. He will judge the poor justly and admonish the humble of the land. God will lift him to everlasting heights, like a fortified tower; he shall smite nations with the might of his mouth, with his sceptre he shall smite the land. God will raise him to the sceptre of rulers and all the nations will serve him. It is not said here who is to be the Prince of the Congregation, but the contents and even the actual expressions are taken to a great degree from Isaiah, chapter 11, which contains one of the main promises of the future greatness of the house of David; they are taken also from the blessing of Jacob to his son Judah (Genesis xlix, 9–10). The prince is mentioned again in the Damascus Covenant (in an exposition of Numbers xxiv, 17).[18] "The sceptre is the prince of the congregation, and when he arises he shall strike violently all the sons of Seth." (CD VII, 20–21). From the expression "when he arises" (ובעמדו) [19] it is evident that an eschatological prince is meant. In another place in the Damascus Covenant the word prince is used instead of king: "and about the prince it is written, let him not multiply wives [20] unto himself, and David did not read in the sealed book of law, etc." (CD V, 1 ff.). From all this it is clear that the prince is the future secular ruler of the congregation, identical with the Anointed of Israel,[21] and that he is the anointed of David.

[18] "There shall step forth a star out of Jacob and a sceptre shall rise out of Israel." This scriptural passage (Num. xxiv, 17) has a central place in the messianic homilies of the Sect. Cf. 4Qp. Gen. xlix; 4Q Testimonia recently published by Allegro, see also below. On messianic exposition of the same passage in rabbinical writings, the Pseudepigrapha; and early Christianity, cf. C. Rabin, The Zadokite Documents, Oxford, 1954, pp. 30 f. Num. xxiv, 17 is also cited in the prayer before battle in 1QM XI, 6–7, but there it does not seem to have any messianic associations. Cf. also Yadin, op. cit. (supra n. 7), p. 323.

[19] Cf. CD XII, 22–24; XIV, 18–19.

[20] Deut. xvii, 17, and there it is distinctly said about the King. Cf. also note 13 above.

[21] Cf. Milik, op. cit. (supra, n. 9), p. 121. On the other hand, I cannot agree with Milik's identification of the hero mentioned in the prayer before battle in

The anointed ones of Aaron and Israel who are destined to arise at the end of days are, as we have shown, identical with the high priest, head of the congregation of Israel, and with the Prince of the Congregation, most probably the future Davidic ruler. The high priest plays a central part in the final war — i.e., the war of the Sons of Light and Darkness — and in the leadership of the people at the end of days. On the other hand, the Prince of the Congregation does not seem to take a very active part in the war and his authority is limited. The high priest takes priority in the session of the council of the community. Moreover, the benediction for the Prince of the Congregation comes after the benedictions for the high priest and priests. All these combined show that according to the texts we have dealt with the people of the Sect attached much greater importance to the Anointed of Aaron than to the Anointed of Israel [22]; and although the Anointed of Israel seems to be of Davidic descent, the fact is not mentioned expressly in these texts.

III

In addition to the above texts we have some further fragments from Qumran 4, published lately by Allegro.[23] In these texts, unlike the ones which only mention the Anointed Ones of Aaron and Israel, we find the expectations for the future ruler, the anointed of righteousness the shoot of David expressly stated. One of the Fragments from a Pesher on Gen. xlix is an exposition of Gen. xlix, 10: ["There shall not] cease a ruler from the tribe of Judah when there be dominion for Israel [24] [and there will not] be cut off an enthroned one (belonging) to (the line of) David,

---

1QM (XI, 6 ff.) with the prince or the Anointed of Israel. Cf. Yadin, op. cit. (supra n. 7), pp. 285, 330–331.

[22] So also in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs; see also below. In rabbinical writings, on the other hand, the King takes precedence over the High Priest (Tosefta Horayoth ii, 9; Bab. Horayoth 13a).

[23] Cf. J. M. Allegro, Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature, JBL, 75, 1956, pp. 174 ff.; Y. Yadin, IEJ, 7, 1957, pp. 66–68; K. Schubert, Die Messiaslehre in den Texten von Chirbet Qumran, Biblische Zeitschrift, 1, 1957, pp. 177–197.

[24] Cf. 1QM I, 5; XVII, 7–8.

(יושב כסא [25] לדויד) for the staff (מחקק) [26] is the covenant of kingship and the families of Israel are the feet (הרגלים) [27] until the coming (עד בוא) [28] of the anointed of righteousness the shoot of David.[29] For to him and to his seed has been given the covenant of kingship over his people for everlasting generations [30] which has awaited [the interpreter] [31] of the law with the men of the community, for it is the assembly of the men of. . . ." Another fragment from a collection of expectations based on the exposition of Biblical texts [32] is based on the prophecy of Nathan

[25] The reading of Allegro (ibid.) בוא is erroneous, as already noted by Yadin (ibid.). The words for "and there will not be cut off an enthroned one to David" are a paraphrase of Jer. xxxiii, 17. Cf. also Ps. cxxii, 5.

[26] The מחקק of Gen. xlix, 10; this term was already understood as meaning the Kingdom of the House of David in the Bible (Ps. lx, 9 = cviii, 9). The same Hebrew term is mentioned in Num. xxi, 18. That scriptural passage is interpreted in CD VI, 3–11 to relate to the Book of the Law and the Leaders of the Sect; and there, the Staff מחוקק is the Interpreter of the Law (CD VI, 7). The term מחקק is also intended for Moses in rabbinical tradition (cf. Targum to Deut. xxxiii, 21). The Exposition of מחקק in one biblical text about the Interpreter of the Law does not necessarily entail the same exposition in another text. Here מחקק cannot mean anything but the Covenant of Kingship. Cf. also the use of the same term ברית מלכות in relation to the rule of the future king the Shoot of David in the same fragment.

[27] The feet (הרגלים) are those mentioned in Gen. xlix, 10. According to the interpretation of the LXX and the Targum, feet here mean descendants. The families of Israel (אלפי ישראל) may be compared to the chiefs of the families of Israel who according to the Rule of the Congregation are the leaders and will sit before the anointed of Israel (Col. I, 14; Col. II, 14–15 almost certain reconstruction). According to this interpretation the families of Israel, i.e., the members of the Sect and their leaders are to be considered as legitimately having the authority of Davidic Kingship until the coming of the anointed of righteousness, to whom and to whose descendants the covenant of kingship was given for everlasting generations. Yadin, op. cit. (supra n. 23), reads הדגלים, in accordance with the Samaritan Recension of Gen. xlix, 10. The degel is one of the military formations mentioned in the Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light. From the photograph of the fragment we are not in a position to decide which of the readings is better. But even so there are many difficulties in Yadin's reading and interpretation.

[28] The words עד בוא represent the words עד כי יבא שילה in Gen. xlix, 10, and their interpretation on the coming of the future anointed king is according to the exegesis of the Targum and the Midrashim. Cf. A. Posnanski, Schilo, Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Messiaslehre, Leipzig, 1904. For the expression "עד בוא משיח הצדק" cf. 1QS IX, 14.

[29] This term is founded on Jer. xxiii, 5. Cf. also "את צמח דויד עבדך מהרה תצמיח" in the Eighteen Benedictions (the 'Amidah).

[30] Cf. 2 Samuel vii, 11 ff.; 1Q Benedictions Col. V, 20 ff.; 4QFl, 1 ff. (Cf. infra, n. 32.)

[31] Cf. 4QFl, 2.

[32] Allegro, op. cit., calls this Text 4Q Florilegium, abbreviated to 4QFl.

in 2 Sam. vii, 11–14. This prophecy which is one of the major promises to the house of David in the Bible is already alluded to in the fragment from 4Qp. Gen. xlix.[33] The fragment begins with a somewhat shortened rendering of the biblical text: "And the Lord tells you that he will build a house for you. And I will set up your seed after you and I will establish his royal throne for ever. I shall be to him for a father and he shall be to me for a son." Then comes the exposition which is about the future ruler: "He is the shoot of David who will arise with the interpreter of the law who [in the][34] end of days as it is written:[35] 'And I will raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen.' That is (היאה)[36] the tabernacle of David that is fallen and after he will arise to save Israel."[37] Another text is a fragment from a Pesher of Isaiah which is an exposition of Is. xi. 1–5, one of the major prophecies on the future greatness of the house of David. Its beginning may be reconstructed[38] "[פשרו על צמח] דויד העומד באח [רית הימים]" meaning: "Its interpretation concerns the shoot of David who will arise at the end of days," and it goes on to describe his greatness and his glory.

The common elements in these three texts are: (1) the place where they were found, i.e., Qumran Cave 4; (2) the statement of hopes for a Messiah of David; these hopes being based on scriptural passages; (3) the use of the term "shoot of David" in all three passages and "interpreter of the law" in two of them (although in two cases, one of each, an almost certain reconstruc-

[33] Cf. n. 31.

[34] The lacuna is at the beginning of the line. There is room for about two words including the two letters "בצ". It is at present impossible to decide whether the words "which . . . in the end of days" apply to the Shoot of David or to the Interpreter of the Law, although I think the latter more probable.

[35] Am. ix, 11. Here and in CD VII, 16: "והקימותי את סוכת דויד" on the other hand M.T. "אקים".

[36] The connecting word "That is" (היאה) rules out the possibility that the repetition is a scribal error. The first time, the tabernacle of David is mentioned in its original biblical meaning; whereas the second mention probably hints at its homiletical exposition. The words, "that is," probably show that it was an exposition well known among the members of the Sect (cf. CD VII, 15 ff.) so that it was enough merely to hint at that exposition. See also below.

[37] The future Davidic king is here probably intended. In 1Q Benedictions too (Col. V, 20 ff.) the delivery of Israel from the yoke of the nations is attributed to the prince of the congregation, i.e., to the future Davidic king.

[38] The restoration is after 4QFl, 3–4: "צמח דויד העומד עם דורש התורה."

tion). We are therefore justified in dealing with all these three texts as one. The hopes for the future king, the shoot of David, the anointed of righteousness stated in these texts, are in varied contrast to the other texts dealt with above, in which there is a disinclination, apparently intentional, to mention the connection of the future king with the House of David.[39] Yet it is quite clear that these new texts too belong to the Sect itself. This we learn not only from their general character, but in particular in view of the specifically sectarian terms "Interpreter of the Law" and "men of the community" which are used there. These texts require a new examination of the conclusions we have stated above with regard to the anointed ones of Aaron and Israel. At the same time, we have to examine in the light of these conclusions, which are based on a scrutiny of all the sectarian writings which are at present available in a more or less complete form, these new texts which Allegro has lately published in fragmentary form. Since, however, the editor chose from the material at his disposal those texts which deal with the Davidic anointed king, we may quite legitimately surmise that in the other texts (as yet unpublished), which deal with the end of days, the future Davidic king is not so prominent. This assumption is strengthened by the fact that the benediction for the prince of the community from the 1 Qumran benedictions [40] may be compared to these new texts in stressing the exalted position of the future ruler. Only the comparison of the blessing for the prince of the community with the other blessings, and the fact that it is placed after the blessing for the high priest and the blessing for the priests sons of Zadok, indicates his secondary position.

In the fragment from the Pesher to Gen. xlix mentioned above, the hopes for the future Shoot of David are quite clearly expressed. To him and to his seed was given the covenant of kingship over his people for everlasting generations: "the families of Israel are

[39] The use of the formula "the anointed ones of Israel and Aaron" implies an intentional avoidance of any direct reference to the Davidic future king. This avoidance is especially noticeable in the texts from the Rule of the Congregation and the Benedictions, dealt with above. In general the Scrolls display a favorable attitude to David, and cf. 1QM XI, 1–3; even in CD V, 1–6, where David's actions are criticized, we find a sentiment favorable to him.

[40] Cf. supra, II.

the feet until the coming of the anointed of David, the shoot of righteousness." And the "families of Israel" (אלפי ישראל) are most probably the people of the community.[41] Here too the dominion of the Shoot of David is presented as a promise which will be fulfilled only in the expected future; in the present this authority is vested in the families of Israel, i.e., in the community as a corporate body. This interpretation is confirmed by the fact that the men of the community and together with them the Interpreter of the Law [דורש התורה] are mentioned further on in the same fragment. The Interpreter of the Law is mentioned in the other fragment 4QFl, and if we examine in detail what is written there ("The Shoot of David who will arise with the interpreter of the law . . . in the end of days"), he is even superior in importance to the Shoot of David. The placing of the Interpreter of the Law together with the Shoot of David is parallel to his placing with the Prince of the Congregation in the Damascus Covenant VII, 19–20. This text in the Damascus Covenant is based on a messianic interpretation of Numbers xxiv, 17: "There shall step forth a star out of Jacob and a sceptre shall arise out of Israel."[42] The star is according to this homiletic interpretation the Interpreter of the Law while the sceptre is the Prince of the Congregation, the Anointed of Israel.[43] In this context there comes in the Damascus Covenant the exposition of Amos ix, 11: "And I will raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen." The tabernacle of David is expounded there (line 20) as the Books of the Law. In 4QFl too the second citation of Amos ix, 11 most probably hints at a homiletical exposition well known to the members of the Sect[44]; it is quite possible that the exposition is the same as the one given in the Damascus Covenant. This combination of the plain text on the tabernacle of David that God will revive with its homiletic exposition, according to which the tabernacle of the King is, most probably, the Torah, in 4QFl may also hint at the subordination of the anointed king to the laws of the Torah. Also in the Pesher on Isaiah xi, where "the shoot of

[41] Cf. n. 27.
[42] Cf. also n. 18.
[43] Cf. supra.
[44] Cf. n. 36.

David who will arise at the end of days," is mentioned, it is also said of him that: "as they teach him (כ[אשר יורוהו)[45] so shall he judge." These words come as an exposition of Isaiah xi, 3: "And he shall not judge after the sight of his eyes, neither decide after the hearing of his ears." This is an exposition which implies severe limitations on the power of the future king, and is against the meaning of the text in Isaiah, for instead of the continuation "with righteousness shall he judge the poor" we find in the Pesher "as they teach him," i.e., the priests,[46] the leaders of the Sect.

As we noticed above, there are points of contact between the Interpreter of the Law who shall arise with the Shoot of David at the end of days (in the fragments from Qumran Cave 4), and the Interpreter of the Law in the Damascus Covenant (CD VII, 19–20). This fact lends plausibility to the theory [47] that the Interpreter of the Law, the leader of the Sect after the Teacher of Righteousness, was regarded as the person who is intended to lead Israel at the end of days, clothed in his authority as the anointed of Aaron. It is most probable that the Interpreter of the Law, as well as the Teacher of Righteousness, the first leader of the Sect, was a priest and belonged to the great priestly house of Zadok; [48] and it is not improbable that the sectarians who hoped for salvation in the near future saw in him the destined anointed high priest. But on the other hand, another text in the Damascus Covenant speaks of the Sect as being led in the ways of the Torah by the Interpreter of the Law: "Until there shall arise a teacher of righteousness at the end of days" (CD VI, 11). Therefore we cannot accept the theory that the Interpreter of the Law was regarded as the future priestly leader, as we are then forced to assume that both the Teacher of Righteousness and the Interpreter of the Law were regarded at the very same time as the destined anointed of Aaron.

Indeed, the problem of the relation between the Interpreter of the Law in his eschatological aspects and the Teacher of

[45] Cf. Allegro, op. cit. (supra n. 23), p. 181.

[46] Cf. the Ordinances for the King in Deut. xvii, 18–20, also Deut. xxxiii, 10 in the blessing of Moses on the tribe of Levi.

[47] Cf. D. Flusser in, Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls, in Memory of E. L. Sukenik, Jerusalem, 1957, p. 86, n. 5; p. 87, n. 8 (Hebrew).

[48] Cf. infra note 100.

Righteousness who will arise at the end of days, requires a fresh treatment in the light of these new texts; [49] it is even doubtful whether the terms "Teacher of Righteousness" and "Interpreter of the Law" are always intended to mean historical personalities, or whether these are just terms with a more general meaning.[50] A possible explanation of the use of the term "Interpreter of the Law" in these new texts from Qumran 4, is to assume that the texts belong to a later period than the time when the historical Interpreter of the Law was active, and that it is signifying a term of honor for the high priest who is intended to lead the nation in the time of salvation, together with the future Davidic king.

The messianic expectations in the texts we have just dealt with come in the form of exposition of biblical texts dealing with the future kingdom of the house of David. Together with the Davidic king we find in them another central personality in the vision of the end of days, namely, the eschatological Interpreter of the Law. The main differences between these texts and the other scrolls concerned with expectations of future salvation are the stress laid on the prominence of the anointed of David, in the new texts, and the intentional avoidance of any explicit mention of the future Davidic king, even when he is implied in the other texts.

As possible explanations of these differences we may suggest the following:

(a) Inside the Sect there was some degree of ideological freedom. Owing to the historical development connected with the growth of the Sect,[51] the authorized leaders of the Sect intended to stress the central position of the priests of the House of Zadok in the future too, and to minimize the importance of the future Davidic king, even though they could not ignore him altogether because of the biblical prophecies of the future Davidic king. But there were others who did

[49] Allegro, op. cit. (supra n. 23), p. 176 proposes to identify the Interpreter of the Law with the teacher of righteousness. On previous proposals that the teacher of righteousness is a Messiah redivivus, cf. infra note 72. N. Wieder, The "Law-Interpreter" of the Sect of the Dead Sea: The Second Moses, Journal of Jewish Studies, 4, 1953, pp. 158–175, identified the Interpreter of the Law with the prophet who will herald the coming of the two Messiahs (1QS IX, 11); while Schubert (supra n. 23), is inclined to identify with the future prophet, the Teacher of Righteousness. See also Flusser, ibid. (supra note 47); Cross, ibid. (supra note 5), pp. 171–173.

[50] Cf. 1QS VI, 6: "איש דורש בתורה."

[51] Vide infra.

not want to minimize the significance of these prophecies to such an extent, and who expounded these selfsame biblical texts on the future greatness of the House of David. It is also possible that they enlarged on these biblical prophecies for the purpose of the Pesher, without having a conscious theological outlook different from that of the others.

(b) The texts in which the future Davidic king is expressly mentioned date from a different period from those where he is only implied, and in the meantime a certain development inside the Sect gave more weight to the expectations connected with the House of David.[52]

From the regulations in the Manual of Discipline and from the Damascus Covenant we know that the Sect was compactly organized, with a strict internal discipline. It therefore seems to me that we must prefer the second explanation, which links the changed attitude towards the anointed of David with historical development, and not with a difference in views between members of the Sect. This development as well as the growth of the doctrine of the two Messiahs will be dealt with after an examination of the relevant texts from the Book of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.

IV

A major difficulty when dealing with the Book of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs is determining what is its original text,

[52] We need not take into account the possibility that the texts which expressly mention the future ruler of the House of David are earlier than the others and that the expectation of a ruler from the House of David progressively lessened because: (a) The major texts (in the present state of publication) are those which do not mention expressly a future Davidic ruler; and it does not seem probable that future publication will alter the situation much. (b) The Sect was established under the leadership of the priests, sons of Zadok (vide infra), and they, hoping for the end of days in the near future, were surely not interested in stressing the importance of the future Davidic king. (c) After the decline of the Hasmonean dynasty and the beginning of Roman oppression, we find evidence of messianic yearnings connected with the House of David in sources which definitely do not belong to the Dead Sea Sect or its adherents (for the first time in the Psalms of Solomon, especially Psalms xvii and xviii), whereas in the earlier apocalyptic literature the Davidic Messiah is not mentioned at all. Cf. also infra n. 106. I am dealing with the historical development of Davidic Expectations in detail, in my book, The House of David from the Fall of the Kingdom of Judah to the Fall of the Second Commonwealth and After, Jerusalem, 1959 (Hebrew).

and what are late additions; a matter which is still in dispute.[53] The Book of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, originally written in Hebrew,[54] is known to us only in its Greek form, and in ancient translations from the Greek. In all these versions Christian interpolations have crept in, but the extent of these interpolations is the subject of disagreement. It is also debated to what extent the book was added to still earlier by Jewish hands, and the divergence of opinion is particularly marked in regard to texts dealing with future destined saviors of Israel. But the close connection between the Book of the Testaments and the Dead Sea Sect literature, which emerges also from these parts of the Testament whose originality is not disputed, helps us to determine its date; and the preceding discussion of the future Messiahs in the scrolls is also of assistance in understanding the system of the two saviors, as expounded in the Book of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.

Before the scrolls were discovered, and before it became clear that there were sectarian circles in Israel who hoped for two Messiahs, one of Aaron and one of Israel, and were at the same time in opposition to the ruling priests of Judea, it was difficult to reconcile the doctrine of the two Messiahs of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs with what was then known of Jewish religion in the time of the Second Commonwealth. On the other hand, the attempts to explain the two Messiahs in the Book of the Testaments brought forth various theories on the development of the messianic idea in the period of the Second Commonwealth. The system of Charles, who related the book to circles close to the Hasmoneans, and was inclined to see in the king and priest mentioned there John Hyrcanus, was the one most widely accepted by scholars. Charles supposed that in the original writing there was only one Messiah from the tribe of Levi who was both king and priest, and that only after the rift between Hyrcanus and the Pharisees had become open, and the opposition to Hasmonean

[53] Cf. R. H. Charles, The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, London, 1908; M. De Jonge, The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, Leiden, 1953, and there pp. 10–12 a review of the different views.

[54] R. H. Charles, The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, London, 1908, pp. XXIII–XXXIII. The notation of the different recensions and Mss. is according to this edition.

rule hardened, was the book newly edited and paragraphs concerning the future savior from Judah added. Charles even claimed [55] that in the thirty years between the rule of Simeon and the end of the reign of John Hyrcanus, the Jewish people jettisoned the idea of a Messiah from David and adopted the idea of a Messiah from Levi. A different explanation was given by K. Kohler and L. Ginzberg.[56] According to them, the Messiah from Levi belongs to a later secondary stratum of the book, while the original book is mainly concerned with the Messiah from Judah, in accordance with accepted Jewish beliefs. Besides these, there were other scholars who maintained the doctrine of two Messiahs but only as applied to part of the texts concerned, and tried to explain it in different ways; [57] and still others who thought that according to the system of the book the Messiah would emerge from the union of the two tribes Levi and Judah.[58] The fact that the system of the two Messiahs was in force in the Dead Sea Sect enables us to reject entirely the supposition of two different strata in the book, in one of which the Messiah is from Levi and in the other from

[55] Charles, Testaments, pp. XCVII ff.; idem, the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, 2, Oxford, 1913, p. 294. V. Aptovitzer (Parteipolitik der Hasmonäerzeit, Wien, 1927) goes even further in his conclusions than Charles. According to Aptovitzer the Testaments are a polemical treatise against the adversaries of the Hasmonean rulers (ibid., pp. 82 ff.). The starting point of the debate, according to Aptovitzer, was the exposition of Ps. cx, 4, "The Lord hath sworn and will not repent thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek"; the Hasmonean party claimed that according to this verse a priest would be the Messiah, while their opponents thought the same verse meant that the Messiah (who would be from the tribe of Judah) would also be a priest. According to Aptovitzer the book of Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, which speaks of a king from the tribe of Levi, was composed inside the Hasmonean party, whose adherents claimed that the king would arise out of the tribe of Levi and the tribe of Judah together, and that the Hasmonean rulers were not only the descendants of Aaron but also the descendants of Judah. On the other hand their opponents, whose opinions are stated, according to Aptovitzer, in some of the Midrashim, admitted that the Messiah would be descended from the two tribes, but claimed that it was David who traced his descent both from Judah and from Levi. Aptovitzer's whole edifice lacks any factual basis, and he twists the sources he uses in order to "prove" his points. Cf. J. Klausner, Qiryath-Sefer, 5, 1929, pp. 348–350; M. H. Segal, Tarbiz 21, 1950, pp. 135–136 (Hebrew).

[56] K. Kohler, Jewish Encyclopedia, xii, pp. 113 f.; L. Ginzberg, Eine unbekannte jüdische Sekte, Monatsch. z. Gesch. u. Wissensch. d. Judenth., 58, 1914, pp. 403–411.

[57] Cf. G. R. Beasley-Murray, The Two Messiahs in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, Journal Theol. Studies, 48, 1947, pp. 1–12. (This paper was not available to me.)

[58] Cf. M. H. Segal, Tarbiz 21, 1950, p. 134 (Hebrew); A. J. B. Higgins, Priest and Messiah, VT, 3, 1953, pp. 323 f.

Judah. The lack of contradiction between the different parts of the book in the matter of the two Messiahs and its agreement with the scrolls [59] will become clear from careful examination of the pertinent texts.

When we come to examine the doctrine of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs on future salvation and on priesthood and kingship, we have to remember that it is a Pseudepigraph which purports to give the words of the sons of Jacob, the fathers of the tribes of Israel. The future events in the lives of their descendants — that is the history of the nation down to the author's own days — must find expression in the book. We have to distinguish in the Book of the Testaments between the appreciation of the past in the vision of the patriarchs and the vision of the end of days which is the future age to the author himself. We must also remember that most of the Book of the Testaments is one work, and the division into twelve testaments is intentional. The details given in the different testaments should therefore be regarded as a unity. We will give here, in the order in which they appear in the Book of Testaments, those texts which deal with kingship and prophecy, saviors from Levi and Judah, and the salvation of Israel.

Reuben vi, 7–12: For to Levi God gave the dominion and to Judah with him and to me also and to Dan and Joseph that we should be for rulers.[60] Therefore I command you to hearken to Levi because he shall know the Law of the Lord and shall give ordinances for judgment and shall sacrifice for all Israel until the end of days of the anointed High Priest [61] of whom the Lord spake. I adjure you

[59] J. H. Grintz, Sinai, 32, 1953, pp. 30 f. (Hebrew), already pointed to the fact. Cf. also, Kuhn, ibid. (supra n. 7); and lately Van der Woude, ibid. (supra n. 7), pp. 190–216. Van der Woude's book arrived in Jerusalem after the paper had already been forwarded to the editors, and it agrees in some details with those reached independently in this paper.

[60] Charles considers as a "foolish interpolation" the inclusion of Judah, Reuben, Dan and Joseph in this verse and thinks that the verse deals only with the supremacy of Levi (Greek Versions, p. 13; Testaments, pp. 13 f.), while De Jonge (Testaments, p. 88) thinks that only Reuben, Dan and Joseph are interpolated. But it is most probable that the four tribes were here mentioned as an allusion to the four standards: the standard of the camp of Judah, the standard of the camp of Reuben, the standard of the camp of Ephraim-Joseph, and the standard of the camp of Dan, according to which the children of Israel pitched camp round the tent of meeting in the desert (Num. ch. ii). Cf. Segal, op. cit. (supra n. 58), p. 132.

[61] ἀρχιερέως χριστοῦ so in most Greek Mss. and the Slavonic Version. One Greek Ms. (h): ἀρχιερεὺς χριστοῦ — "The high priest of the anointed"; which is mean-

> by the God of heaven to do truth each one unto his neighbour and to entertain love each for his brother. And you draw near to Levi in humbleness of heart, that you may receive a blessing from his mouth. For he shall bless Israel, and Judah (*τὸν Ισραηλ καὶ τὸν Ιουδαν*) because him (*ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ*) hath the Lord chosen to be king over all the nation. And bow down before his seed, for on your behalf he will die in wars visible and invisible [62] and will be king for ever.

This passage in the Testament of Reuben begins with the dominion that God gave to Levi and Judah. It applies in a general way to the Government that was in the hands of the tribe of Levi before the foundation of the Israelite Kingdom and during the Second Commonwealth, and to the Kingship of the Davidic dynasty before the Babylonian Exile. Then comes the exhortation to hearken to Levi because he has been given the offices of judgment and sacrifice, and the eschatological anointed priest is also referred to. After that is mentioned the Kingship of Judah whom God has chosen to be king over all the nation and it is expressly stated that from his seed shall come forth the King Messiah.

According to Charles [63] the words: "because him hath God chosen to be king" apply to Levi, while the words "and Judah" are connected only with the preceding part of the sentence where it is said that Levi shall bless Israel and Judah. According to him both the priesthood and royalty of Levi are here mentioned and are intended to mean the dominion of the Hasmoneans. But even in the text as it stands the words: "because him hath God

---

ingless, and which Charles corrects to *ἀρχιερεὺς χριστός* — "The anointed high priest." According to the emendation of Charles the meaning of the text is that the anointed high priest, i.e., the Hasmonean ruler, shall sacrifice until the end of days. Not only is Charles' reading based on the one Ms. in which these words are corrupt, but as we have already seen (supra II), the expression "anointed priest" necessarily means the high priest at the end of days.

[62] The expression, "for on your behalf he will die in wars visible and invisible," is difficult. Charles (Testaments, p. 16), retranslating it into Hebrew, proposes יעמוד — "will stand forth" instead of ימות — "will die," and at the beginning of the verse זרעו — "his arm," "his might," instead of זרעו — "his seed," and interprets his emended text on the wars of the Hasmonean high priests. Not only are the emendations and interpretation offered by Charles improbable in themselves, but the verse as a whole is intended for Judah and not for Levi. The one who fights these wars is the future king from the tribe of Judah.

[63] Cf. Charles, Testaments, p. 16.

chosen to be king," definitely apply to Judah and not to Levi.[64] Furthermore we may assume that the text originally was: "And you draw near to Levi . . . for he shall bless Israel and to Judah [65] because him hath God chosen to be king." In any case, we have here the promise of priesthood to Levi as against the promise of royalty to Judah.

In the Testament of Reuben the position is this: Hegemony among the tribes of Israel to Levi and to Judah; Levi has a more prominent standing than Judah; Messianic hopes connected with an anointed priest from Levi and a king from Judah.

> Simeon vii, 1–2: And now my children obey Levi and Judah, and be not lifted up against these two tribes for from them shall arise unto you the salvation of God. For there shall arise from Levi as if it were High Priest and from Judah as if it were King God and man and he shall save all the nations and the race of Israel.

The expressions: "God and man" and "all the nations" are obvious Christian interpolations,[66] and the whole phrase from "God and man" appears to have been rewritten from a Christian point of view. Originally it was probably something like — and through them shall all Israel be saved.

The Testament of Simeon gives the following: Hegemony to Levi and Judah; priesthood to Levi and royalty to Judah; salvation of Israel in Levi and in Judah.

The Testament of Levi stands out from the others. At the beginning comes a vision (Levi ii,5 — v,6), in which Levi sees sights similar to those described in the Ethiopic Book of Enoch. Levi beholds the seven firmaments of heaven, the angels of the Lord and the glorious presence of the Most High. Towards the end of the vision he is destined to priesthood (v,2). Then comes a second vision (ch.viii) in which Levi sees seven men in white raiment, who clothe him in the robe of priesthood and the other paraphernalia of the High Priest, and authorize him to serve the Lord as a priest. And then they say to him (viii,11–16):

[64] And if we retain the present text, the words, "because him hath God chosen" signify the reason why Judah was given a special blessing.

[65] We may assume that the Greek translator understood the Hebrew "וליהודה" as accusative and translated "*καὶ τὸν Ιουδαν*." Cf. Grintz, op. cit. (supra n. 1), p. 31.

[66] Cf. Charles, Greek Versions, pp. 25–26.

Levi, thy seed shall be divided into three offices, for a sign of the glory of the Lord that is to come. And the first portion shall be great, greater than it shall be none. The second shall be in the priesthood. And the third shall be called by a new name, because a king shall arise from Judah (ἐκ τοῦ Ιουδα) and shall establish a new priesthood after the fashion of the nations to all the nations (read, "because a king like all the nations shall arise from Judah and shall establish a new priesthood")[67] and his presence is beloved as a prophet of the Most High, the seed of Abraham our father.

The first two who are to arise from the seed of Levi are agreed by most scholars to be Moses and Aaron. Charles[68] wanted to see Hyrcanus in the third one and instead of a "King shall arise from Judah" (ἐκ τοῦ Ιουδα) i.e., Judah the tribe, which is given in all the extant manuscripts of the Testaments he wished to read "a king shall arise in Judah" (ἐν τῷ) i.e., Judah the land; accordingly, he interprets the text on a king from Levi who shall arise in the land of Judah. But this is quite arbitrary,[69] and, even if we accept it, the identification with Hyrcanus is rather far-fetched. According to the actual text, the third one from the seed of Levi is a priest who will be established in his office with the help of the king from Judah, and this description most probably applies to the priest Zadok,[70] who according to the tradition in Chronicles was already placed at the head of the intricate priestly organization in the time of David; and until the time of the Hasmoneans the high priestly family were regarded as his descendants. What is more, the expression "and his presence is beloved as a prophet of the Most High; the seed of Abraham our

[67] The words, "after the fashion of the nations to all the nations" represent a dittography in the Hebrew text. The correct reading is no doubt "like all the nations" (ככל הגויים) and it applies, as Dr. D. Flusser has pointed out to me, to the king who shall arise from Judah. Cf. Deut. xvii, 14, "I will set a king over me like all the nations that are around me"; I Sam. viii, 5: "Now make us a king to judge us like all the nations." The phrase, "A king like all the nations shall arise from Judah" tallies with the Scriptures. On the other hand, priesthood after the fashion of the nations, which means equating the priesthood with the priesthood of idol-worshippers, does not harmonize in any way with the views of the author of the Testaments.

[68] Charles, Testaments, p. 45; followed by many others.

[69] Cf. Ginsberg, op. cit. (supra n. 56), pp. 407 f.

[70] Cf. T. W. Manson, Journal Theol. Studies, 48, 1947, pp. 60–61 (this was unavailable to me); Grintz, op. cit. (supra n. 1), p. 32.

father" is more applicable to David than to any other king of Israel.

Together with the glorification of the descendants of Levi we find in the Testament of Levi the most violent denunciations of the priesthood. The misdeeds of priests in future generations are described with remarkable vividness (Levi ch. x; chaps. xiv–xv, especially xiv, 5–7).[71] After this there comes an apocalyptic vision describing the decline of the priesthood from generation to generation (chaps. xvi–xvii) — from the first who is anointed to priesthood and shall speak to the Lord, and his priesthood shall be perfect (xvii, 2), down to the last priests who are lovers of money, adulterers, idolaters, and lascivious abusers of children and beasts. God will take his vengeance upon the evil priests, and will then raise up a new priest [72] (ch. xviii), by whom all the words of the Lord shall be revealed. He shall execute righteous judgment on earth, and his star shall arise in heaven as of a king. He shall shine forth as the sun, the heavens shall be opened and from the heavens shall come upon him sanctification. In the time of his priesthood the expected end of days shall come, evil shall cease

[71] The description of the degeneration and decline of the high priesthood in these chapters, and in the Testament of Levi ch. xvii, is parallel to the description in the Psalms of Solomon ch. viii. These descriptions are founded on the deeds of the hellenizing priests in the days of Antiochus IV, but are very much exaggerated. Their origin is in the polemical literature of the first Hassidim. This literature was most probably read by the sectarians and used in their accusations against their opponents the priests of Jerusalem; we need not regard these descriptions as intended to mean specific Hasmonean rulers.

[72] Charles, Testaments, pp. 62 f., regards the evil priests as the hellenizing priests in the time of Antiochus IV, while the new priest who shall arise after them is, according to him, the Hasmonean house and especially John Hyrcanus. But in the Testament of Levi, ch. xviii an eschatological priest is described and even if we did not know about the points of contact between the Dead Sea Sect and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs it would be impossible to agree with Charles' identification. Dupont-Sommer (Nouveaux aperçus sur les manuscrits de la Mer Morte, Paris, 1953, pp. 64–84) identifies the seven anointed priests in the Test. of Levi xvii as the Hasmoneans. The first he identifies as Judas Maccabaeus and the seventh as Aristobulus II. The new priest, according to Dupont-Sommer, is the teacher of righteousness who (according to him) was killed during the time of Aristobulus II and was expected to rise again as the anointed one (ibid. p. 79). However, the identification of the anointed priest in Testament of Levi xvii which Dupont-Sommer offers is unfounded, and, what is more, based in some places on a misinterpretation of the text. Cf. also B. Otzen, Studia Theologica 7, 1954, 146 f.; Cross, ibid. (supra note 5), pp. 118 f. The theory that the new priest is the teacher of righteousness redivivus (a theory first propounded by S. Schechter, Documents of Jewish Sectaries I, Cambridge, 1910, pp. XII ff.) is also doubtful.

and the righteous shall rejoice. This new priest is described in the vivid colors of a Messiah, but it is nowhere said that he will be a king or even that there will not be a king at that time; on the contrary, it is his priesthood that is emphasized.

In this apocalyptic vision in the Testament of Levi we have emphasis on the superiority of the priesthood; and hope for a new priest who shall arise at the end of days. It thus has many points of similarity with the doctrine of the Dead Sea Scrolls where we also find a preference of the priests, especially the sons of Zadok, coupled with serious accusations against the priests of Jerusalem, and expectation of a future anointed priest. The total effect is, of course, different, but the points of similarity we have enumerated lead us to assume that if these testaments were not composed in the Sect itself, they originated in circles whose social and ideological background was very close to that of the Dead Sea Sect.

In the Testament of Levi there is no kingship of Levi to be found, the kingship is for Judah and the priesthood for Levi; at the end of days a messianic new priest will arise.

> Judah xxi, 1–2: And now, my children, I command you, love Levi, that you may abide and exalt not yourselves against him lest you be utterly destroyed. For to me the Lord gave the kingdom and to him the priesthood, and he set the kingdom beneath the priesthood.

A similar verse to Judah xxi, 12 is found in a fragment from the so-called Aramaic Testaments from Qumran Cave 1: ולך ולב]ניך מלכות כהנותא רבא מן מלכות[א [73] — "to you and to your sons kingship. The priesthood is superior to the kingship." The stress upon the superiority of Levi over Judah and of course over all the other tribes recurs in Judah ch. xxv.

[73] Barthélemy-Milik, op. cit. (supra n. 2), p. 88. Milik reads the first letter ב but כ seems better. P. Grelot, Notes sur le Testament aramëen de Levi, RB 63, 1956, p. 396, n. 2 offers the reconstruction:

"ולך ולב]ניך מלכות כהנותא רבא מן מלכות [חרבא"

explaining it as pointing to two kingships, the kingship of priesthood and the kingship of the sword. But while the proposed reconstruction of the beginning of the line is very plausible, his reconstruction at the end of the line and the way in which he explains the whole, are most improbable. The reconstruction and explanation offered in the text above, which are in complete concord with the Testament of Judah xxi, 2, are to be preferred.

In chs. xxi–xxiii we have a short survey of the history of Israel from the point of view of the acts and behavior of the kings, followed by a promise that God will renew the Kingdom of Judah after its destruction and will not destroy the kingdom from the seed of Judah for ever (xxii, 2–3). Charles [74] argues that a whole section of the Testament of Judah xxi, 6–xxiii, 5 is not in its proper place, but is a later addition which should be interpreted as a severe polemic against the Hasmonean kings Aristobulus II and Hyrcanus II. But Charles does not bring any concrete reasons for his argument; the passage seems rather to be an organic part of the Testament of Judah dealing with the future of his descendants. Just as in the Testament of Levi (chs. xvi–xviii), after the survey of the history of the tribe comes a vision which is messianic in content (xxiv, 1–6):

> And after these things shall a star arise to you from Jacob in peace and a man shall arise from my seed like a sun of righteousness walking with the sons of men in meekness and righteousness and no sin shall be found in him.[75] And the heavens shall be opened unto him to pour out the spirit, (even) the blessing of the Holy Father.[76] And he shall pour out the spirit of grace upon you. And you shall be unto him sons in truth, and you shall walk in his commandments first and last. This branch of God most high, and this fountain giving life unto all.[77] Then shall the sceptre of my kingdom shine forth, and from your root shall arise a stem and from it shall grow a rod of righteousness to the nations, to judge and to save all that call upon the Lord.

Charles [78] finds in this chapter two separate messianic prophecies, both of them out of place. The first (xxiv, 1–4) concerns the Messiah from Levi, the second is a later addition. De Jonge [79]

[74] Charles, Testaments, p. 91.

[75] The Armenian Version is much shorter, "And after these things shall arise a star of peace and he shall walk with men in meekness and righteousness and the heavens, etc."

[76] *πατρὸς ἁγίου* — the expression in its present form is Christian.

[77] So in some Greek Mss. (c, h, i); in the others we have, "This fountain unto life for all flesh." According to Charles (Testaments, p. 97) the whole verse is an interpolation. In the Armenian Version we have, "Then a branch shall go forth from me."

[78] Charles, Testaments, pp. 95 f.

[79] De Jonge, Testaments, pp. 89 f.

claims that this chapter and the whole book of the Testaments are Christian, and that this prophecy concerns Jesus. But it is hardly credible that in the Testament of Judah there should be no messianic expectations for the House of David; moreover, the fact that before this vision (xxi, 1–2) as well as after it (xxv, 1–2), the superiority of Levi over Judah is stressed, rules out any assumption of the Christian character of these chapters as a whole.

Expectations for the future in the Testament of Judah (xxiv) are restrained in comparison with those in Levi (xviii) and are mainly concerned with the sceptre of Judah as a king. Also in Judah xxiv, 1, instead of "a man shall arise from my seed," it may be that we should read "from his seed," [80] i.e., from the seed of the star of Jacob mentioned in the first part of the verse, which is not necessarily Judah. From this assumption we may conclude that verses 1–4, 5–6 in the Testament of Judah xxiv are not concerned with the same person, and in view of the great similarity in content and expressions between Judah xxiv, 1–4 and Levi xviii, 3–4, it is not improbable that the first part of Judah xxiv was originally intended for the savior from Levi under whose leadership salvation will be brought and justice will prevail. And then the sceptre of the kingdom of the ruler from Judah shall shine forth. This theory is supported by the fact that in these chapters in the Testament of Judah, the superiority of Levi over Judah is stressed; and it may be that the exposition of Num. xxiv, 17 ("There shall step forth a star out of Jacob") in the Testament of Judah xxiv, 1 ("and after all these shall a star arise to you from Jacob") suggests the star of the new priest in the Testament of Levi (xviii, 2–3: "And then shall the Lord raise up a new priest . . . and his star shall arise in Heaven"). In the second part of the chapter, in verse 5, we have the expression "sceptre of my kingdom" which hints at the second part of the same verse in Num. xxiv, 17 ("and a sceptre shall arise out of Israel"). An exposition of Num. xxiv, 17 on two different persons is also found in the Covenant of Damascus VII, 18–21,[81] where the

[80] In the Hebrew text "מזרעו" instead of "מזרעי," i.e., ו instead of י. In some of the Dead Sea Scrolls (so the Isaiah Scroll A) the ו is sometimes written with a short stem and is almost indistinguishable from the י.

[81] Cf. supra, III.

sceptre is expounded as meaning the future prince of the congregation. We may assume here too that the verse is expounded to mean the new priest from Levi and the future king from Judah.[82]

The Testament of Judah gives special emphasis to the superiority of Levi over Judah; we also have here a prophecy of a future king from the tribe of Judah, and perhaps of two anointed ones from Levi and Judah.

> Issachar v, 7: And Levi and Judah were extolled by the Lord even among the sons of Jacob; for the Lord gave them an inheritance, and to Levi he gave the priesthood and to Judah the kingdom.

[82] After this paper was completed a study by K. Schubert, Testamentum Judah 24 im Lichte der Texte von Chirbet Qumran, appeared in the Wiener Zeitschrift fur die Kunde des Morgenlandes, 53, 1957, pp. 227–236. Schubert also points out the close similarity between Test. Judah xxiv and the messianic expectations of the Dead Sea Sect. He even attempts to reconstruct the Hebrew original of this chapter, drawing upon the theological terminology of the Sect. His conclusions are founded on the Hebrew text that he reconstructed. This experiment is most enlightening; but on the other hand if we recast the Testaments into a proposed Hebrew original we cannot, in the present state of research, use that reconstructed text to prove a point.

Schubert is inclined to regard Test. Judah xxiv as referring to the anointed of David, and only in verse 1 does he find an intimation of the two anointed ones. Schubert's theory is based on: (1) a reconstruction of verse 1 as follows, "ואחר כך ידרוך כוכב מיעקב בשמים ויקם גבר משבטי כשמש תצדק" (כשמים being an emendation of בשלום which the Greek indicates). Here Schubert seems to find a clear inference to Num. xxiv, 17, "There shall come a star out of Jacob and a sceptre (שבט) shall rise out of Israel," and as this biblical text is connected, in the writings of the Sect, with the expectations of the anointed ones of Aaron and Israel (vide supra), the beginning of Test. Judah xxiv points to the same figures. (2) Schubert's theory is also based on several terms or expressions which are traditionally connected with the Davidic Messiah; some of these in verses 5–6, verses which are undoubtedly intended for the Davidic future king; but one of these terms "צמח" appears according to Schubert in verse 4, which in the Greek versions belongs to the first part of Test. Judah xxiv, i.e., that part of the chapter which I regard as applying to the anointed one of Aaron.

It is especially on these two points that Schubert's reconstruction is, at least, unfounded: (1) In verse 1 he retranslates the Greek into Hebrew, "ויקום גבר משבטי" (and a man shall arise from my tribe [= שבט]); but the Greek *σπέρμα* usually means seed, and never a tribe or sceptre. If we reject this unfounded emendation there is nothing more to support Schubert's view that in this verse the sceptre of Num. xxiv, 17 is mentioned or even implied. (2) In verse 4 Schubert translates, "צמח לאל עליון הואה (sic.)" (He is the "shoot" of the God most high). The Greek word *βλαστός* which Schubert translates as "צמח" (the inverted commas are in Schubert's German translation) is used in the LXX for some Hebrew words connected with growth and sprouting, but never for "צמח." The word for "צמח" in the LXX is usually *Ἀνατολή*. Cf. also Van der Woude, ibid. (supra notes 9, 59) pp. 206 f.

Here we have hegemony among the tribes to Levi and Judah; priesthood to Levi and kingship to Judah.

> Dan v, 4: I know that in the last days you shall depart from the Lord, and you shall provoke Levi to anger and fight against Judah but you shall not prevail against them. For an angel of the Lord shall guide them both; for by them shall Israel stand.
>
> Dan v, 9–10: And so when you return to the Lord you shall obtain mercy and he shall bring you into His sanctuary, and He shall give you peace and there shall arise unto you from the tribe of Judah and of Levi (ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς Ιουδα καὶ τοῦ Λευι) the salvation of the Lord. And He shall make war against Beliar, etc.

Charles [83] regards the word Judah in verse 10 as an interpolation and reads: "there shall arise unto you from the tribe of Levi the salvation of the Lord." According to him this is to be proved from the fact that in the text before us we have "from the tribe of" and not "from the tribes of." But it is much more probable that the word "tribe" is to be regarded as the interpolation, and the original text was "from Judah and Levi" or "from Levi and Judah." The rest of this verse "And He shall make war, etc." as well as the previous verse (Dan v, 9) is concerned with God and not with Levi or Judah.[84]

According to the Testament of Dan, the salvation of the Lord shall be from the two tribes Levi and Judah. This testament does not concern itself with the historical priesthood or kingship; this has already been dealt with at length in the previous testaments.

> Naphtali viii, 2–3: Do you also charge your children that they be united to Levi and to Judah. For through Judah shall come the salvation of Israel and in him shall Jacob be blessed. For through his tribe, etc.

[83] Charles, Greek Versions, p. 138.

[84] The verse which comes after these cited above, Dan v, 11, "And the captivity shall He take from Beliar; the souls of the saints, and turn the disobedient hearts unto the Lord and give to them that call upon Him the eternal peace," evidently concerns God, and not the human savior, even though in the text that is before us it is written that He shall turn the disobedient hearts, "unto the Lord" and not "unto Him."

Here apparently the salvation of Israel is only in Judah, although Levi is also mentioned. Charles [85] emends the verse as follows: "For through them (Levi and Judah) shall come the salvation, etc." Segal [86] offers the reading: "For through Judah shall come the salvation of Israel and in Levi shall Jacob be blessed." But the whole passage shows definite signs of Christian elaboration, and in verse 3 we even find a characteristic Christian expression such as: "Shall God, dwelling among men, appear on earth." We cannot, therefore, place here too much importance on the exact wording, but the general meaning is the supremacy of the two tribes Levi and Judah. In Naphtali v, 3–4 there comes a vision in which Naphtali sees Levi grasping the sun while Judah seizes the moon, i.e., the supremacy of Levi over Judah is most clearly stated.

Gad viii, 1: Do you also tell these things to your children, that they honour Judah and Levi for from them shall the Lord raise up [87] salvation to Israel.[88]

In the Testament of Gad we have salvation of Israel in Judah and in Levi. Like the Testament of Dan, it does not concern itself with the historical priesthood and kingship.

Joseph xix, 11–12:

Greek Mss. and Slavonic Recension	*Armenian Version* [89]
Do you therefore my children observe the commandments of the Lord, and honour Levi and Ju-	And do you my children honour Levi and Judah for from them shall arise the salvation of Israel.

[85] Charles, Greek Versions, pp. 155 f.

[86] Segal, op. cit. (supra note 56), p. 133. If we follow Segal's suggestion, we have only to read "ובלוי" instead of "ובו," i.e., the error was already in the Hebrew text of the Greek translator.

[87] *ἀνατελεῖ* — this word may mean "arise" as well as "raise up."

[88] *σωτηρίαν* — so in the Greek Mss. c, g, h, i, and in the Armenian Version. We have to prefer this reading to the reading of Ms. b — *σωτῆρα*, only according to the reading of this one Ms. can we interpret the verse to mean that the Lord shall raise up the savior of Israel from the two tribes. The reading in Mss. a, d, e, f — *σωτήρ* has a Christian character, for according to this reading the verse means that there shall arise (cf. the preceding note) from the two tribes the Lord savior of Israel.

[89] According to the translation of Charles, Greek Versions, pp. 211 f.; Testaments, pp. 195 f.

dah. For from them shall arise unto you the lamb of God who shall take away the sin of the world saving all the nations and Israel. For his kingdom is an everlasting kingdom which shall not pass away, but my kingdom among you shall come to an end as a watcher's hammock which disappears after the summer.

For my kingdom which is among you shall come to an end as a watcher's hammock which will not appear after the summer.

In the Greek Version we have expressions such as: "The lamb of God who shall take away the sin of the world saving all the nations" which is most clearly a Christian interpolation. The expression: "For his kingdom is an everlasting kingdom which shall not pass away" also seems to be of Christian origin. Whereas the shorter Armenian Version seems to be nearer to the original.[90] The main difference between the Armenian and the Greek in the parallel parts is in verse 11. Whereas in the Greek we have: "For from there shall arise unto you the one who shall save," i.e., a savior from the two tribes, we have in the Armenian the noncommittal: "For from them shall arise the salvation of Israel." Here too we are to prefer the text that underlies the Armenian version; for in other Testaments (Simeon vii, 1; Dan v, 10; Gad viii, 1; etc.) we do find in the Greek as well as in the Armenian the same formula: "Salvation of Israel" or "Salvation of the Lord," as applied to Levi and Judah. The kingdom that shall come to an end, in these verses from the Testament of Joseph, is the Northern Kingdom of the Ten Tribes. Of Levi and Judah it is here simply said: "Do you therefore my children honour

[90] Cf. Charles, Testaments, p. 191. Christian interpolations are also found in the Testament of Benjamin xi, 2. In one of the Mss. (c). we find: "And there shall arise in the end of days one beloved of the Lord from the tribe of Judah and Levi, a doer of His good pleasure in his mouth." In other Greek Mss. and the Slavonic recension we have here a passage most clearly pointing to Paul. On the other hand in the Armenian version Benjamin says about his own tribe: "And I shall no longer be called a captain of robbers and a wolf on account of your ravages, but one beloved of the Lord and a doer of the good pleasure of His mouth" (cf. Gen. xlix, 27; Deut. xxxiii, 12). Cf. also Charles, The Greek Versions, pp. 230 f.; Segal, op. cit. (n. 56 supra), p. 133, n. 17.

Levi and Judah for from them shall arise the salvation of Israel."

From the texts we have examined, and they are all the texts in the Book of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs which concern this subject, we have obtained a consistent picture.[91] Kingship from Judah and priesthood from Levi in the historical past as well as in the messianic future; hopes for the salvation of Israel in Levi as well as in Judah; superiority of the priesthood over kingship, i.e., of Levi over Judah. We do not have in the Book of the Testaments a savior or ruler who will emerge from both tribes, nor do we have a concentration of the offices of king and priest in the hands of a ruler from the tribe of Levi.

A similar attitude to priesthood and kingship is found in the Book of Jubilees. According to Jub. xxxi, 9 ff., Isaac blesses in a spirit of prophecy before his death Levi and Judah; he lays his right hand on Levi and his left on Judah as a sign of the superiority of Levi over Judah.[92] He also blesses Levi first. In this blessing (xxxi, 13–18) the holiness, greatness and glory of the sons of Levi are described, and their great honor as servants of the Lord and teachers of his Law, who bless the people in the name of the Lord. They shall be judges and princes and chiefs to all the seed of Jacob. The blessing over Judah (xxxi, 18–21) is much shorter, and the stress is on the rule of Judah as king, his strength in war and power, and the fear of the nations before him. The blessings

[91] Table summing up the attitude to Levi and Judah in the different Testaments:

	Reuben	Simeon	Levi	Judah	Issachar	Dan	Naphtali	Gad	Joseph
Superiority of Levi over Judah	vi:7,11			xxi:1–2 xxv:1–2			v:3–4		
Priesthood to Levi; Kingship to Judah	vi:8,10	vii:2	viii:11–16	[illegible]	v:7				
Salvation of Israel in Levi and Judah		vii:1				v:4,7	viii:2–3	viii:1	xix:11
The new priest at the end of days	vi:8	vii:2?	xviii:1ff.	xxiv:1–4?					
The messianic King at the end of days	vi:12	vii:2?		xxii:2–3 xxiv:5–6					

[92] According to Jub. xxxii, 8–9, Levi officiated as a priest in Bethel before his father Jacob and also received from his father tithes. Cf. also Jub. xxx, 18–19; 32:1.

in the main apply to the historical Levi and Judah, but the picture given by the author of the Book of Jubilees (who belonged to the same sectarian circles [93] as the author of the Book of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs) is in accord with the description of the future messianic time in the Book of the Testaments, which is also most probably that of the author of the Book of Jubilees.

V

The doctrine of the two anointed ones, one from Aaron and the other from Israel (i.e., David), and the special position of the anointed of Aaron as against the anointed of Israel is rooted in the particular social and religious background of the sects at the time of Hasmonean rule. It is only in sectarian writings that we find this doctrine clearly expressed and expounded.

Indeed the anointed ones of Aaron and Israel are not saviors in the true sense of the word, but leaders of the people in the time of salvation, and we also find a cosmic redeemer appointed from the beginning of time, who is hinted at in sectarian writings [94] and explicitly mentioned in related works.[95] But there is no real contradiction between this superhuman figure and the anointed ones of Aaron and Israel. And furthermore in later eschatological systems we find a savior with both human and cosmic characteristics that cannot logically be combined. The most celebrated example is Jesus, who is regarded in the Gospels as both human and divine. In a lesser degree we find this feature in Judaism too.[96] Moreover, the different aspects of the character of the savior and the various eschatological systems left their mark even after they had passed

[93] Cf. supra, I.

[94] The wondrous councillor whose supernatural birth is described in The Thanksgiving Scroll (1QH III, 10 f.); cf. also, J. Licht, The Thanksgiving Scroll. Jerusalem, 1957, pp. 51, 76 ff. (Hebrew).

[95] The Son of Man in the Ethiopic Book of Enoch, chs. xxxvii–lxxi (The Similitudes of Enoch). Cf. H. H. Rowley, The Relevance of Apocalyptic[2], New York, 1946, pp. 58 ff.

[96] Cf. P. Volz, Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im Neutestamentlichen Zeitalter, Tübingen, 1934, pp. 173 ff.; J. Klausner, The Messianic Idea in Israel (Trans. from the 3rd Hebrew Ed.), New York, 1955, passim.

away, and we find in rabbinic literature [97] as well as in Christianity [98] traces of a priestly Messiah.

The central position of the anointed of Aaron in the eschatological system of the Dead Sea Sect is the result of a long historical development on the one hand and of the circumstances of the formation of the Sect on the other. The rise of the priesthood to a position of authority and rule in Judea had already begun after the return from Babylonian exile, and at the end of the Persian period, or shortly afterwards, the high priest was already ruler of Judea and its official representative to the foreign governing power; even the changes which came over Judea with the rise of the Hasmonean house maintained the rule in the hands of the high priesthood. In the prophecies of Zechariah in the vision of the two anointed ones (iv, 1–5, 11–14) and the prophecy on the shoot (vi, 12–13) the high priest already appears as equal to the future king, or at least not much inferior. In the song of praise at the end of the Book of Ecclesiasticus we also find, alongside the benediction "to Him that makes a horn to sprout for the house of David" (li, 12), the benediction "to Him that chooses the sons of Zadok to be priests" (ibid.). Even after the upheaval that took place in Judea, when the Hasmonean house arose and the sons of Zadok [99] came down from their exalted position, the

[97] Cf. Cant. Rabba 2: 29; Bab. Sukkah 52b, etc. Cf. Ginzberg, op. cit. (supra n. 56), pp. 411–428; Grintz, op. cit. (supra n. 1), p. 32. Some hints of a priestly Messiah are probably also found in Karaite literature; cf. N. Wieder, The Doctrine of the Two Messiahs among the Karaites, Journal of Jewish Studies, 6, 1955, pp. 14–25.

[98] Cf. Hebrews, passim. Cf. also Y. Yadin, The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Epistle to the Hebrews, Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Jerusalem, 1957, pp. 36–55. On efforts to find the conception that the Messiah is also a priest, in other books of the New Testament, cf. F. Friedrich, Beobachtungen zur messianischen Hohepriestererwartung in den Synoptikenn, Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, 53, 1956, pp. 265–311, esp. pp. 275 ff.

[99] The Hasmoneans, who were provincial priests and belonged to the division of Jehoiarib (1 Macc. ii, 1) most probably did not belong to the house of Zadok. The fact that the blessing, "to Him that chooseth the sons of Zadok to be priests," which comes in the song of praise at the end of the Hebrew Ecclesiasticus (li, 12) is not repeated in the later prayers, and that the whole song of praise does not come in the Greek translation of Ecclesiasticus, may show that from the time of the Hasmoneans and onward the sons of Zadok did not generally officiate as high priests. The special emphasis in the writings of the Dead Sea Sect that the men of the Sect separated themselves from the remainder of the nation under the leadership of the sons of Zadok ("When they shall gather [in the assembly to] walk according to the Law of the priests sons of Zadok and the men of their covenant

leadership of the people and the rule of the country was yet retained in the hands of the high priests.

The beginning of the Dead Sea Sect was after the sons of Zadok came down, but not a long time afterwards; the leaders of the Sect were descended from the sons of Zadok [100] who strove to restore their former glory. The Sect grew most probably from the extreme pietists, the Hasidim, at the time of the persecutions of Antiochus IV.[101] These fled to the desert, hid in caves and gave their lives to uphold the Torah (1 Macc. ii, 29–42). Among them were also priests from the aristocratic house of Zadok. Evidence of the presence of priests of high lineage among them is preserved in rabbinical tradition on Jose ben Joezer, who was most pious in priesthood — חסיד שבכהונה (Mishnah Hagigah ii, 7), and was also the uncle of Yaqum-Alcimus,[102] the high priest at the time of persecution of Antiochus. We learn of the conservatism of those circles and their adherence to the leadership of the house of Zadok from the fact that the Hasidim were ready to accept the peace offers of that same Alcimus who was made high priest by Antiochus

---

who forsook [the way] of the people, they are the men of His counsel who kept His covenant in the midst of wickedness"; Rule of the Congregation Col. I, 1 f.; cf. for the proposed readings 1QS V, 1–3; etc.) also probably shows that the Hasmoneans did not belong to the family of Zadok. And one of the reasons for their severe antagonism to the Hasmonean high priest (The Wicked Priest 1Q p. Hab. passim, cf. M. H. Segal, The Habakkuk Commentary and the Damascus Fragments, JBL, 70, 1951, pp. 137 ff.) was most probably that in their opinion the Hasmoneans were not properly qualified to act as high priests.

[100] On the status of the priests in the Sect, cf. 1QS II, 19–21; IX, 7; Rule of the Congregation Col. II, 13–14; CD XIV, 3; and especially on the status of the sons of Zadok, 1QS V, 2–3; Rule of the Congregation, passim; etc. On the leadership of the Sect from its foundation by the son of Zadok, cf. supra note 99. It is most probable that the founder of the Sect, the Teacher of Righteousness, as well as the Interpreter of the Law (the leader of the Sect after him) belonged to the high priestly family of Zadok. That the Teacher of Righteousness was a priest we learn from the fragments of a Pesher to Psalm xxxvii published by Allegro (PEQ, 1954, pp. 69–75) where it is said, "its interpretation concerns the priest the teacher of righteousness" [צדק]פשרו על הכהן מורה ה," p. 71, Col. II, 15). Cf. also 1Q p. Hab., II, 7–8; and further fragments from p. Ps. xxxvii (J. M. Allegro, JBL, 75, 1956, pp. 94–95). The Interpreter of the Law was also most probably a priest, as we learn from the fact that the interpretation of the law was one of the offices of the priests (cf. 1QS V, 9–10; VI, 6; CD XIII, 1–3; XIV, 6–8); this is affirmed by his position, in the various texts dealt with above, as the leader who is to stand at the end of days together with the Davidic king.

[101] On the history of the Sect cf. the works mentioned in note 5 supra.

[102] Cf. Gen. Rabba 65: 18 — Jakum of Zeraroth (i.e., Alcimus) was the nephew of Rabbi Jose ben Joezer of Zeredah, etc.

away, and we find in rabbinic literature [97] as well as in Christianity [98] traces of a priestly Messiah.

The central position of the anointed of Aaron in the eschatological system of the Dead Sea Sect is the result of a long historical development on the one hand and of the circumstances of the formation of the Sect on the other. The rise of the priesthood to a position of authority and rule in Judea had already begun after the return from Babylonian exile, and at the end of the Persian period, or shortly afterwards, the high priest was already ruler of Judea and its official representative to the foreign governing power; even the changes which came over Judea with the rise of the Hasmonean house maintained the rule in the hands of the high priesthood. In the prophecies of Zechariah in the vision of the two anointed ones (iv, 1–5, 11–14) and the prophecy on the shoot (vi, 12–13) the high priest already appears as equal to the future king, or at least not much inferior. In the song of praise at the end of the Book of Ecclesiasticus we also find, alongside the benediction "to Him that makes a horn to sprout for the house of David" (li, 12), the benediction "to Him that chooses the sons of Zadok to be priests" (ibid.). Even after the upheaval that took place in Judea, when the Hasmonean house arose and the sons of Zadok [99] came down from their exalted position, the

[97] Cf. Cant. Rabba 2: 29; Bab. Sukkah 52b, etc. Cf. Ginzberg, op. cit. (supra n. 56), pp. 411–428; Grintz, op. cit. (supra n. 1), p. 32. Some hints of a priestly Messiah are probably also found in Karaite literature; cf. N. Wieder, The Doctrine of the Two Messiahs among the Karaites, Journal of Jewish Studies, 6, 1955, pp. 14–25.

[98] Cf. Hebrews, passim. Cf. also Y. Yadin, The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Epistle to the Hebrews, Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Jerusalem, 1957, pp. 36–55. On efforts to find the conception that the Messiah is also a priest, in other books of the New Testament, cf. F. Friedrich, Beobachtungen zur messianischen Hohepriestererwartung in den Synoptikenn, Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, 53, 1956, pp. 265–311, esp. pp. 275 ff.

[99] The Hasmoneans, who were provincial priests and belonged to the division of Jehoiarib (1 Macc. ii, 1) most probably did not belong to the house of Zadok. The fact that the blessing, "to Him that chooseth the sons of Zadok to be priests," which comes in the song of praise at the end of the Hebrew Ecclesiasticus (li, 12) is not repeated in the later prayers, and that the whole song of praise does not come in the Greek translation of Ecclesiasticus, may show that from the time of the Hasmoneans and onward the sons of Zadok did not generally officiate as high priests. The special emphasis in the writings of the Dead Sea Sect that the men of the Sect separated themselves from the remainder of the nation under the leadership of the sons of Zadok ("When they shall gather [in the assembly to] walk according to the Law of the priests sons of Zadok and the men of their covenant

leadership of the people and the rule of the country was yet retained in the hands of the high priests.

The beginning of the Dead Sea Sect was after the sons of Zadok came down, but not a long time afterwards; the leaders of the Sect were descended from the sons of Zadok [100] who strove to restore their former glory. The Sect grew most probably from the extreme pietists, the Hasidim, at the time of the persecutions of Antiochus IV.[101] These fled to the desert, hid in caves and gave their lives to uphold the Torah (1 Macc. ii, 29–42). Among them were also priests from the aristocratic house of Zadok. Evidence of the presence of priests of high lineage among them is preserved in rabbinical tradition on Jose ben Joezer, who was most pious in priesthood — חסיד שבכהונה (Mishnah Hagigah ii, 7), and was also the uncle of Yaqum-Alcimus,[102] the high priest at the time of persecution of Antiochus. We learn of the conservatism of those circles and their adherence to the leadership of the house of Zadok from the fact that the Hasidim were ready to accept the peace offers of that same Alcimus who was made high priest by Antiochus

---

who forsook [the way] of the people, they are the men of His counsel who kept His covenant in the midst of wickedness"; Rule of the Congregation Col. I, 1 f.; cf. for the proposed readings 1QS V, 1–3; etc.) also probably shows that the Hasmoneans did not belong to the family of Zadok. And one of the reasons for their severe antagonism to the Hasmonean high priest (The Wicked Priest 1Q p. Hab. passim, cf. M. H. Segal, The Habakkuk Commentary and the Damascus Fragments, JBL, 70, 1951, pp. 137 ff.) was most probably that in their opinion the Hasmoneans were not properly qualified to act as high priests.

[100] On the status of the priests in the Sect, cf. 1QS II, 19–21; IX, 7; Rule of the Congregation Col. II, 13–14; CD XIV, 3; and especially on the status of the sons of Zadok, 1QS V, 2–3; Rule of the Congregation, passim; etc. On the leadership of the Sect from its foundation by the son of Zadok, cf. supra note 99. It is most probable that the founder of the Sect, the Teacher of Righteousness, as well as the Interpreter of the Law (the leader of the Sect after him) belonged to the high priestly family of Zadok. That the Teacher of Righteousness was a priest we learn from the fragments of a Pesher to Psalm xxxvii published by Allegro (PEQ, 1954, pp. 69–75) where it is said, "its interpretation concerns the priest the teacher of righteousness" [צדק]פשרו על הכהן מורה ה," p. 71, Col. II, 15). Cf. also 1Q p. Hab., II, 7–8; and further fragments from p. Ps. xxxvii (J. M. Allegro, JBL, 75, 1956, pp. 94–95). The Interpreter of the Law was also most probably a priest, as we learn from the fact that the interpretation of the law was one of the offices of the priests (cf. 1QS V, 9–10; VI, 6; CD XIII, 1–3; XIV, 6–8); this is affirmed by his position, in the various texts dealt with above, as the leader who is to stand at the end of days together with the Davidic king.

[101] On the history of the Sect cf. the works mentioned in note 5 supra.

[102] Cf. Gen. Rabba 65: 18 — Jakum of Zeraroth (i.e., Alcimus) was the nephew of Rabbi Jose ben Joezer of Zeredah, etc.

after Menelaus (2 Macc. xiv, 3, 7), mainly because he was from the legitimate high priestly family (cf. 1 Macc. vii, 12–14). It seems most probable that a considerable number of the Hasidim and especially the priests sons of Zadok among them were opposed at a later date to the taking over of the high priesthood by the Hasmonean house from the sons of Zadok. And when the rule of the Hasmonean house was made permanent and the high priests from the Hasmonean house embarked upon wars of conquest, entered into political alliance with Gentiles and adapted themselves to the ways of life of the Hellenistic rulers, this opposition intensified. At the same time, during the reign of Hyrcanus I or even earlier, the priestly Teacher of Righteousness arose, who was most probably from the Zadokite family of high priests, and organized the Sect [103] as a united and compact body. This Sect separated itself, as we have already remarked, from the mass of the nation and considered itself to be the only true Israel.

The striving for redemption of the Dead Sea Sect, the fact that for hundreds of years it had been customary to see in the high priest the only ruler and leader of the people, and the central position of the sons of Zadok in the Sect brought about the formation of a doctrine which placed at the head of the congregation of Israel in future times a high priest — the anointed of Aaron. But the unlimited authority of the Bible, which the Sect shared with the rest of the people of Israel, required the appearance of a Davidic Messiah in any eschatological system where redemption is brought by earthly persons. And so, when they formed this image of an eschatological priest, they could not disregard the prophecies on the house of David in the Bible; and they placed at the side of the anointed of Aaron the anointed of Israel, that is, the king who would arise from the house of David.

According to the Dead Sea Sect, the anointed of Aaron would probably arise from the family of Zadok, from which house the leaders of the Sect came. On the other hand, families whose descent from the house of David was confirmed no longer existed in Palestine at that time either inside or outside the Sect.[104] But

[103] Vide CD I, 7–10, and cf. supra note 100.

[104] Cf. J. Liver, The Problem of the Genealogy of the Davidic Family after the Biblical Period, Tarbiz, 26, 1957, pp. 229–254 (Hebrew; English summary ibid. pp. I–III).

the hope for an anointed of David was not connected with the physical presence of a family tracing its descent from the house of David at that time. This hope was connected with the belief that the house of David did exist inside the nation, even if it was not known who its representatives were, and the Davidic Messiah would appear at the appointed time, even though before his appearance his identity might be unknown. The announcement of the coming of the future time and the establishment of the identity of the anointed of Aaron from the house of Zadok and the anointed of Israel from Israel — the Sect, are among the functions of the prophet who would arise at the end of days.[105]

The doctrine of the two Messiahs in the Book of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs is identical, as we have shown, with that found in the writings of the Dead Sea Sect; and those parts in the Book of the Testaments which are concerned with the Messiahs of Judah and Levi belong either to the Sect itself or to circles close to it. We have no evidence at all for the existence of a doctrine of two Messiahs outside the Dead Sea Sect and its related circles. From the decline of the Hasmonean kingdom onward we find the belief in a messianic ruler from the house of David in Israel in full force, while in the apocalyptic visions in the Book of Daniel which belong to the time before the Hasmonean rule, there is no terrestrial Messiah at all.[106] It may not seem improbable on the face of it that the doctrine of two Messiahs — the one from Aaron being the more important — should arise among the adherents of the Hasmonean priestly rulers, but these were well established in their rule and it is rather far-fetched to assume that they encouraged eschatological hopes whose realization would

[105] Vide 1QS IX, 10–11, "until the coming of a prophet and the anointed ones of Aaron and Israel," and cf. 1 Macc. iv, 46. See also Silberman, op. cit. (supra n. 10), where this question is dealt with in detail.

[106] The expression anointed one (משיח) nevertheless occurs in the Book of Daniel. In Dan. ix, 25 "one anointed the prince" is mentioned and in verse 26 it is said, "And after the three score and two weeks shall an anointed one be cut off." No eschatological ruler is meant here but only a king or high priest, according to the usual meaning of this term in the Bible. The period of the first of these anointed ones is after the Babylonian exile and he is usually identified with Cyrus (cf. Isa. xlv, 1), Zerubbabel or the High Priest Joshua. The other anointed one is usually identified with the High Priest Onias IV who was removed from office by Antiochus IV. Cf. J. A. Montgomery, The Book of Daniel, Edinburgh, 1927, pp. 378 ff.; A. Bentzen, Daniel, Tübingen, 1952, pp. 74 f.

limit their authority. Insofar as we have evidence, during the whole period of Hasmonean rule the belief in a future messianic king from the house of David was present as a vague hope for the very distant future.[107] This belief was general, and only among sectarians was there added the figure of a priestly Messiah, and the doctrine of two Messiahs peculiar to them took shape.

We may assume that in its later history the Sect underwent a certain development which gave more prominence to the future expectations connected with the house of David. That this really was so we learn from the new texts from Qumran Cave 4 where more stress is placed on the Davidic future king than in most of the other texts. This development most probably happened after the persecutions which the Sect underwent, and after the disappointment at the delay in the coming of expected salvation.[108] It is also possible that the general trend at the time of the decline of Hasmonean rule — which brought about the rise of the hope for

[107] For the belief in a future king from the House of David among the Hasmoneans and their adherents, we may turn to the words that the author of the First Book of Maccabees puts into the mouth of Mattathias in his last speech to his sons, "David for being merciful inherited the throne of kingship for ever" (1 Macc. ii, 56), which furthermore implies a belief in the eternity of the House of David. In the same trend he tells of the confirmation of Simon in his office, "and the Jews and the priests are well pleased that Simon shall be their prince and high priest for ever until a true prophet shall arise" (1 Macc. xiv, 41). Appointing a permanent order "until a true prophet shall arise" may be regarded as proof that the Hasmoneans distinguished clearly between the duration of their rule and the future salvation; for the coming of the true prophet is the first stage towards that end. Compare the use of that same formula in the Dead Sea Scrolls (cf. supra n. 105). On the other hand, the fact that the Hasmonean rulers proclaimed themselves kings and the early Halakhah regards them as the legitimate kings for their time (cf. G. Alon, Sinai 12, 1943, p. 25 ff.; Hebrew) may teach us that the Hasmoneans and their adherents, as well as the people and the Pharisee rabbis, regarded the hope for the renewal of the Davidic kingdom as an expectation for a distant future age. And cf. the Baraitha in Bab. Talmud Sotah 48b, "Come and hear: When the First Temple was destroyed, the cities with pasture land were abolished, the Urim and Thummim ceased, there was no more king from the House of David. And if anyone incites you to quote 'And the governor said unto them that they shall not eat of the most holy things till there stand up a priest with Urim and Thummim' [reply to him] as when one man says to another 'until the dead revive and the Messiah son of David comes' (i.e., it is only a phrase for the very remote future)"; also cf. Yer. Kid. 4:1. On the other hand the pious author of the Psalms of Solomon, who wrote at the time of the last Hasmonean princes, after the Roman conquest of Jerusalem, and hoped for redemption and salvation in the near future, accuses the Hasmonean kings of having usurped the throne reserved for the descendants of David (Ps. xvii). Cf. also supra n. 52.

[108] Cf. Flusser, op. cit. (supra n. 6), pp. 97 ff.

a Davidic Messiah — influenced the members of the Sect indirectly. This trend found expression in sectarian writings in the emphasis laid on the prominence and royal status of the Prince of the Congregation at the end of days, who is explicitly called "the Shoot of Righteousness, the Anointed of David"; but all this without leaving to any marked degree the framework of faith and doctrine which traditionally prevailed in the Sect, and most probably without giving up the central position of the anointed of Aaron in its eschatological system.

FISHERS OF MEN

Footnotes on a Gospel Figure

CHARLES W. F. SMITH

Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Massachusetts

The use of the term ἁλεεῖς ἀνθρώπων, "fishers of men" at Mark 1:17 (on which depends Matthew 4:19 but only indirectly Luke 5:10) has often been treated as a self-evident metaphor.[1] "The words of Jesus summon Simon and Andrew to become disciples and heralds of the Kingdom of God," Vincent Taylor says.[2] Other figures might have sufficed for this dual purpose and the peculiar nature of the metaphor is not explored when the terms "disciples" and "heralds" are used. What is the relationship of disciples to Jesus and how heralds were related to the Kingdom is not made clear although the Markan term may have been intended to do something of this kind. It is insufficient to observe that, since the four men are depicted as fishermen, the summons is appropriately phrased. The metaphor has a Biblical background which provides some clue to the nature of their new calling or, since they are already fishermen, to a new type of fishing and a new catch. Riesenfeld underlines the importance of the phrasing of the call but does not enquire into its meaning.[3]

The figure is in many respects inappropriate if the mission of the disciples is thought of as rescuing men or bringing them to salvation. It lacks the eminent suitability of the more widely used Biblical metaphor of the shepherd seeking the strayed sheep. The Interpreter's Bible makes the assertion, "It is a genial and dramatic metaphor."[4] It is dramatic certainly, but in what sense is it genial? Fishing is a congenial diversion and perhaps occupa-

[1] See the use of "selbstverständlich" in the Billerbeck quotation below.

[2] V. Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark, p. 169. "It is astonishing how widely appraisals of the story can differ" (p. 168). The development suggested below may account for this.

[3] H. Riesenfeld, "The Ministry in the New Testament" in A. Fridrichsen (ed.), The Root of the Vine, p. 109. Riesenfeld observes, "Christ is not himself designated a *fisher*." There is no suggestion in the Bible that the Messiah casts the net, though Lohmeyer (infra, p. 32, n.6) notes that in Clement of Alexandria Jesus is designated ἁλιεὺς μερόπων.

[4] G. A. Buttrick on Matthew 4:19, Interpreter's Bible, Vol. 7, p. 276.

tion — for the fisherman, but scarcely for the fish. For them his coming is ominous. When Lohmeyer says that the disciples as fishers will draw men out of the "dark sea" in which men live into another world, this bodes no good for fish for whom the shore normally is a world in which they will die and not live.[5] We see that the metaphor has almost immediately lost its natural meaning by being transferred to the world of men. Yet Lohmeyer has correctly observed that in the Old Testament the figure had a sinister (*übeln*) meaning. Here it has a double function. Billerbeck says that it is self-evident that it has here not a disagreeable meaning (*selbstverständlich keine hässliche Bedeutung*) even though in the Rabbis it has the unedifying sense of outwitting men.[6] There is thus manifest an uneasiness about the figure as it is normally understood.

The possibility that Jesus or the primitive Christian preacher used well-known figures in an entirely new sense seems remote. The same question arises over the similitude of the leaven in Matthew 13:33. Biblically leaven suggests an evil influence and not a good. In the parable the leaven is used in a purely domestic manner and it is in its complete penetration or in the ferment it causes throughout that the meaning must be looked for.[7] It is difficult to suppose that hearers familiar with the customary use of a metaphor would be capable of grasping that it was being used in a manner entirely new without any indication that this was the case.

Recently J. Manek has suggested that we should look for an explanation of "fishers" in the background of "old cosmogonical myths" in which the waters represent chaos, an enemy to be subdued and which may be equated with the pit of the underworld.[8] Hence to be fishers of men involves here no play on words but refers to the task of saving mankind in language suitable to the myth-

[5] E. Lohmeyer, Das Evangelium des Markus, p. 32. The meaning in Lohmeyer is beneficent but the terms used suggest a cosmogony which lies in a more remote background as advanced by J. Manek and referred to below.

[6] H. L. Strack and P. Billerbeck, Kommentar zum N.T. aus Talmud und Midrasch, Vol. I, p. 188 on Matthew 4:19.

[7] See my The Jesus of the Parables, pp. 70 f. The change in meaning may be found in Ignatius, Magnesians, X.2. where *νέαν ζύμην* takes the place of Paul's *ἄζυμοι* in I. Corinthians 5:7,8.

[8] J. Manek, "Fishers of Men" in Novum Testamentum, Vol. II, Fasc. 2. (April 1957) pp. 138–141. I am indebted to Dr. K. Stendahl for referring me to this article.

ical understanding of the sea. Manek says the fish in the Fourth Gospel and primitive Christianity symbolize converts. The figure of the water, he says, may be further applied in relation to Jesus' walking upon it and Peter's attempt to do so and to the stilling-of-the-storm pericope. There can be no question that the cosmic myth forms the background of some Biblical material, e.g., in Jonah. The difficulty here is that the metaphor of fishing is sought to be explained by the elucidation of a metaphor which is only in the background. That it is the immediate clue to the figure involved in Mark is to be doubted since there lies at hand a more closely associated Biblical usage. Manek has mentioned the use in Jeremiah to which I draw renewed attention, but has not attempted to apply it. He further has not examined a possible difference between the Markan pericope and the development of it in Luke and John, nor the associated case of the fishnet in Matthew. By doing this with Jeremiah's words in mind I think it becomes questionable whether we can say, "To be a fisher of men means to be a shepherd." [9] The question is how it becomes possible to read "fishers" as though it meant something akin to the pastoral image. The same objection may be made to any attempt to understand the term from the scant references in literary Greek.[10] These seem to suggest a rare attempt to use a metaphor which well might come to mind but does have the difficulty I suggest. On the other hand, there is in the Biblical literature a use of the figure which made it appropriate though the meaning had to be changed when ways of thinking of Jesus' mission changed.

The ominous ring of the fishing metaphor if taken in its natural sense is confirmed by the Old Testament. In Amos 4:2 the women of Israel are threatened with a judgment which finds apt expression in fishing language, "Behold, the days are coming upon you, when they shall take you away with hooks, even the last of you with fishhooks. In Habakkuk 1:14,15 the Chaldeans are agents of

[9] Ibid., p. 140.

[10] See the references in J. J. Wetstein, Novum Testamentum (1751) under Matthew 4:19 and in Arndt and Gingrich, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, under ἁλιεύς. The comparison of the Sophists to anglers has a sense similar to that found in the Rabbis referred to above. See also the references to Diog. Laert. etc. by A. D. Nock in "Conversion and Adolescence" in Pisciculi (Antike u. Christentum, Ergänzungsband I, 1939), p. 166, to which the author has kindly drawn my attention.

judgment and appear as fishermen with a net and the men they pursue as fish. The term is used most clearly in Jeremiah 16:16 where it stands in close relation to the Gospel figure, "Behold, I am sending for many fishers, says the Lord, and they shall catch them. . ." (RSV). The MT has

הנני שלח לדוגים רבים נאם יהוה ודיגום

and the LXX translates, Ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω τοὺς ἁλεεῖς τοὺς πολλούς, λέγει Κύριος, καὶ ἁλιεύσουσιν αὐτούς· It is clear that this is a resumption of the theme of vss. 10–13 ("for I will show you no favor") into the midst of which vss. 14–15 are an interpolation from Jeremiah 23:7,8. The intrusion barely tempers the theme of judgment in which the people are to be wrenched from their natural environment, fished and hunted out of every hiding place. The intrusive verses look forward to an eventual restoration, but the figure of the fishers is a sinister one which the intrusion does nothing to mitigate. (There is a slight precedent here, in the editorial attempt to soften the meaning, to the process which is carried further in the Gospel modification of the term.)

These Old Testament passages might be discounted as outmoded usage except that the same theme has appeared in the Hodayôth or "Psalms of Thanksgiving" from Qumran where it testifies to a period much nearer the time and temper of the Gospels. The passage is found in column 5 and reads in Sukenik's transcription [11] from plate 39, lines 7–8 as follows:

ותשמני במגור עם דיגים רבים פורשי מכמרת
על פני מים וצידים לבני עולה

(". . . and thou has placed me in terror of many fishermen who spread nets upon the waters and hunters for the sons of unrighteousness. . . ."). Translations of this passage vary but it is clear in all of them that the figure of the fishers is one of judgment and the fishermen are its agents.[12]

[11] E. L. Sukenik, The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University, Plate 39.

[12] J. Baumgarten and M. Mansoor ("Studies in the Hodayot-II," J.B.L. LXXIV. II. Sept. 1955, p. 193) translate, "And Thou hast placed me in terror/With many fishermen / Who spread a net over the face of the waters / And (with) those who hunt the sons of injustice / And there for judgment hast Thou established me." M. Burrows, (The Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 408), "Thou didst put me in a dwelling. . . ." T. H. Gaster (The Dead Sea Scriptures, p. 149), "and though Thou hast placed me full oft / in ready reach of their haul. . . ." This is modified by a more literal version in Gaster's notes (ibid. p. 214, n.3) "And Thou hast placed me in the drag (Heb. *magor*; cf. Habakkuk 1.15) with many fishermen. . . . " It is a question whether מגור is to be read "dwelling" or "terror" as both meanings are possible

There is then the probability that the call of Jesus to Simon and Andrew, "Follow (after) me and I will make you fishers of men," had the same intention — a commission to gather the people for judgment. This must be considered in the light of the "mission of the Twelve" and of other passages in the Gospels which deal with the disciples in relation with fishing.

All commentators have been impressed with the apparent abruptness of Jesus' call, the lack of preparation for it, the immediate response of the disciples without question or qualification as though to an inescapable imperative, involving a complete severance with their former way of life.[13] Lohmeyer has best expounded this impression. He recalls the imperative which caused an Amos or a Jeremiah to become prophets, Jesus' words having the compelling nature of "a sharp military command" which made it impossible for them to act otherwise than as they did. This naturally poses the question, "Who, then, is this who calls?" Lohmeyer says, "He commands as God commands. . . He makes of the fishermen something new, *what he will*" (my italics).[14] This sudden impact and its immediate result have prompted the form-critics to call the incident an "epiphany-story." For Dibelius it is a legend rather than a true paradigm.[15] For Bultmann, who deals with it under "biographical apothegmata," it is an "ideal scene" constructed out of the life of the early community and he asks whether it may not have been spun out of the metaphor from the Old Testament.[16]

---

for גור. In the latter case עם would have to be understood in the sense of "over against." Gaster's "drag" is suggested by the Kal Impf. יגרחו and not by the words חרם or מכמרת in Habakkuk 1:15 and seems less likely, but it does suggest the point of view of the fish rather than the fisherman. It is not entirely clear that this is what is meant but the context of judgment is unmistakable and in line with the Old Testament. Baumgarten and Mansoor comment, with reference to Jeremiah 16:16, "From the latter allusion it is clear that the author is here referring to the divine agents of punishment" (ibid., p. 193). The phrase

פורשי מכמרת על פני מים

is a reproduction of Isaiah 19:8 (except for the vowel ו in פורשי) and so appears in IQIs.a, but is not extant in IQIs.b. Similar lines in column 3, line 26 of the Hodayoth appear to have the context of dread.

[13] In the Gospels this is not followed up by the description of a new kind of fishing but rather by the "training" (to use an older phrase) of the disciples. I shall hope to show why this is so.

[14] Op. cit., p. 32.

[15] M. Dibelius, From Tradition to Gospel (Eng. trans.), p. 109, cf. p. 44.

[16] R. Bultmann, Die Geschichte der Synoptischen Tradition, p. 26, cf. p. 60 and E. Klostermann, Das Markusevangelium, p. 14.

The attitude of the early Church, however, toward the theme of fishing needs examination and reveals a difficulty with this viewpoint. It is not easy to see how the scene arises from the words rather than the words from the scene and neither may be the best statement of the case. Does it go without saying (Bultmann) that it is an ideal scene if the metaphor is treated in its original Biblical sense? The dramatic picture may be an idealization but it will appear that "fishers of men" is hardly the right figure for the construction of such a scene if it is a picture of the call of Christian disciples in the sense in which Christian disciples (or even apostles) is usually understood. Granted that there is a similarity, even verbal, between δεῦτε ὀπίσω μου and the call issed by a Rabbi,[17] yet, as Lohmeyer notes, this is no call to be "learners" in the usual sense. The one who calls calls in a different manner and a different atmosphere pervades the scene.[18]

Older commentators and modern "liberals," struck by the imperative suddenness of call and response have sought an explanation on grounds of psychological appropriateness. By way of example Goguel's summary of the problem may serve. "These men respond to the call of someone whom they do not know, and who does not even tell them what he wants from them." [19] Psychological elucidation is impossible since no grounds are provided unless one uses uncritically John 1:35–51, which posits a previous acquaintance between Jesus and the Four. The attempt only serves to underline the problem and to increase the impression of the true nature of the Markan pericope as one which requires an explanation in which the abruptness would be a fit characteristic — as, for example, in a matter of urgency with regard to a fulfillment which needed no previous explication. This brings our attention back to the nature of the metaphor, "fishers."

If it were we who were being called, a psychological explana-

[17] Klostermann, op. cit., p. 15. Cf. E. Schweizer, "Discipleship and Belief in Jesus as Lord from Jesus to the Hellenistic Church" in New Testament Studies, Vol. 2., No. 2., Nov., 1955, p. 88. The article is a "theological interpretation." Of the call of Levi he says, "In the call of Jesus, God himself breaks through the barrier to the sinner." The issue here is not a call of the sinner to repentance but of fishermen to a new kind of fishing.

[18] Op. cit., p. 32.

[19] M. Goguel, Life of Jesus (Eng. trans.), p. 87. At pp. 324 ff. Goguel resorts to the Johannine explanation but the fact that John makes this pericope intelligible does not offer proof that it so happened.

tion might indeed be necessary, though even today a sense of vocation to the Gospel may be brought to a point of decisive action quite suddenly by a spoken message, even one uttered by a complete stranger. To indulge, however, in such analysis of motives is to leap out of the first century situation. Eschatological motivation and response may be susceptible to psychological analysis (conceived perhaps as a form of neurosis) but the analysis would contribute nothing to the exegesis of this passage. It must be understood in the light of the expectations of the times and the atmosphere generated by them, even if this light has the effect, for us, of emphasizing the darkness.

Long ago Schweitzer saw correctly that "the call of the disciples" was not a call to *disciples*. Whatever one may think of his solution as a whole, his words taken apart from the context of a deliberate precipitation of the Messianic woes are more nearly correct. "They are not his helpers in the work of teaching; we never see them in that capacity, and He did not prepare them to carry on that work after his death." [20] As "fishers" their call was to an eschatological task which would virtually preclude learning and teaching in the ordinary sense. The essential element of leisure would be lacking. There is a marked difference between an agent and a professor, much more between the agent of an alien power (cf. Lohmeyer) and a student (cf. Mark 1.22). Picking a master to follow needs some prior observation. In picking disciples to be taught an "admissions procedure" is necessary. Here neither is told about, not simply because the pericope is an independent unit, but because the nature of the case is different. The term "fishers of men" does not necessarily involve either a capacity for learning or confidence in Jesus as an able teacher, but only that the call come with force and the demand be irresistible. This is precisely what the pericope underlines and it is seen to do so when the expression is read in its contemporary sense.

We need not be surprised if this raises a question for us. The term, we shall see, was a problem for the early tradition and it had to be reoriented. The charge to the disciples (e.g., Mark

[20] A. Schweitzer, The Quest of the Historical Jesus, p. 369. He does not refer to the term. It may be noted here how giving a Gospel pericope a title ("The Call of the Disciples") will for decades influence or even determine its exegesis. See instances in The Jesus of the Parables, pp. 60, 81, 110 etc.

6:7–11; Luke 10:1–20) is so clearly representative of a later situation that all traces of an earlier mission (if it existed) which fits this call remain only as eschatological fossils embedded in an account of the Christian mission. The same abruptness is found in the call of Levi (Mark 2:13,14) though the term "fisher" is not applied. It would fit less neatly his previous occupation but that does not mean that Levi is called to a different work nor that the word "fishers" can be applied only to those who fished before they were called. Were it not that fishing was a very probable occupation in Capernaum we might be more inclined to say that the occupation of the Four arose from the terms of their call rather than to say that the term arose from their occupation. In actual fact we need make neither assumption. The record is satisfied if we take the phrase to be a term appropriate to the task, defining the task (so that Goguel is not quite right to say that Jesus does not tell what he wants from them). It provides a play on words but it is not sufficiently explained as simply a play on words. The matching of word to situation is both Biblical and characteristic of the picture of Jesus in the Gospels — as appears from a study of the parables.[21] The fact that an eschatological understanding of "fishers of men" is uncongenial to us is neither here nor there. If it explains the text it makes a claim to be understood on its own terms. I believe it does and that it adds sense to the Markan context.

It is possible to exaggerate the isolation of Mark 1:16–20 from its context (emphasized for example by Bundy in a recent summary)[22] whether it circulated so or was a construction. The question of the context is not clearly asked because "form-history" precludes the asking if, by definition, the pericope is to be treated in isolation. After examination apart we are not permitted to use any connection we still observe with what precedes or follows as an indication of anything that might have happened in any (mod-

[21] E. P. Gould, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Mark, p. 18, says, "This is the first instance of parabolic language." In a sense this is true since the words fit the stated occasion but it is not a similitude. J. Schniewind, Das Evangelium nach Markus, correctly observes that Jesus used parabolic language to stir up the hearers (p. 51).

[22] W. E. Bundy, Jesus and the first three Gospels, pp. 70 ff. He designates it, "A highly subjective piece of tradition" and the assumptions are those of "the Christian believer" (p. 71).

ern) sense as history. It does, however, seem necessary to ask what purpose the pericope serves just here and why the evangelist or his source chose to put it here. The apartness appears the more certain the more readily we take the metaphor to apply to the usual conception of apostles, missionaries and preachers ("fishers of men") or of disciples ("follow me"). Is the apartness so clear if we assume it to involve an eschatological call — that Jesus is summoning the men in question to serve as agents of the Kingdom of God now announced to be at hand, that they are to gather a people for judgment as the term "fishers of men" initially suggests?

The preceding proclamation (Mark 1:15) then has at least some connection and is not, as Bundy proposes, suddenly dropped. The call is to repent in the face of the imminent Kingdom and suggests at first the Gospel accounts of the mission of John the Baptist [23] dictated by his conviction of an imminent "Coming One" or "Mightier One." The charge, "believe in the Gospel" (RSV for πιστύετε ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ) may also be read, "Believe in the proclamation" or even "in the good news." Have we not here a transition from "Kingdom — repent" to "repent — Gospel" which has not so clearly affected the next section? [24] The words of 1:15 must be read as an attempt to distinguish between the mission and message of John and that of Jesus. The appearance of the (later unused) term "fishers of men" may cause us to reread the previous verses and to ask whether an imminently arriving Kingdom of God is necessarily *good* news — for instance to those who prefer their own will and their own institutions to God's will and His Kingdom?

We may ask the same questions of the pericopes which follow — those embraced in "a typical day at Capernaum" (1:21–38). In v. 24 the demon detects a threat and finds Jesus' presence to issue in more than a threat. The reaction of the people (vv. 22,27) is one of unmixed joy only if we choose to read it so — as perhaps

[23] Cf. Goguel; also J. A. T. Robinson, "Elijah, John and Jesus," in New Testament Studies, Vol. 4, No. 4, 1958.

[24] The phrase τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ is properly a technical Christian term (used by Paul in six cases) and is here probably used by Mark of the Christian Gospel (see 1:1) which is good news of salvation in Christ and could hardly have been preached by Christ. At this place it is not possible to get behind it unless we isolate the proclamation in the form, "the time is fulfilled, and the Kingdom of God is at hand, repent."

the Evangelist, writing from the security of a Christian point of view, meant it to be read. The complex ends, after further description of the impact Jesus made, with his decision to delay no longer for healing and exorcism but to move on and make his proclamation elsewhere. This is consistent with an eschatological reading of "fishers of men." There is at least a continuing impression of urgency. If we ask whether this applies to the function of the Four (later Twelve) we detect that not far below the surface this is so. Verse 37 then reads as an aberration on the part of Simon and his associates when they want Jesus to stay where he is popular. In Mark their commission, overlaid as it is in the variety of recensions, is fundamentally to keep moving, rapidly and without delay, proclaiming the Kingdom and testifying to that proclamation by the signs they will find accompany it (e.g., Mark 3:14–15; 5:6–13; cf. Matthew 9:35–10:16). It may be suggested that an original stratum envisages them as engaged in the task of "fishing," that is, of gathering the people for judgment. They go out, briefly, as "fishers of men." Only in the later strata have they become "apostles" of the Church.

M.-J. Lagrange detected the eschatological relevance of the term.[25] For him the image carried its own mark of authenticity but he surmised that it might have only a future reference — after the death of Jesus or after the Kingdom's arrival (instead of before) — though he understood its significance with regard to bringing people together "au point où Dieu les veut." [26] The call is rather, in the terms used, a promise of fulfillment, another indication of the maturing of the eschatological time, a discreet application of the general announcement of the time fulfilled, the Kingdom at hand, a promise that the judgment anticipated will begin and that men may be selected to share in the gathering of the people for this purpose. They are, by these words, chosen at the call of him who, by this call, is announced implicitly to be the principal Agent of the judgment.

When we go on to ask about the *Sitz im Leben* of the Markan pericope the call is referred to the missionary activity of the early "Apostles." Expositors assume this to be its relevance. But there

[25] M.-J. Lagrange, Évangile selon Saint Marc, pp. 18 f.
[26] Taking Mark's infinitive in this sense and putting *deviner* in italics.

appear signs that the primitive Church found it necessary to develop the figure before it acquired this (more benevolent) meaning. A difficulty in placing the section in its Church-setting is the limitation of the disciples called to four. There is an obvious purpose in the story to tell something about these men (their occupation and local origin) and how they came to be "numbered among" the Twelve.[27] It is not so clear how a calling so expressed can be interpreted of all Christians.[28] Christians are not invited to become fishers but to take up their cross and follow or to be baptized and receive the Spirit. The obvious connections to be explored are those which concern the mission of the Twelve and passages which visualize the work of any of them as fishermen. The mission, in the Synoptic context, seems to precipitate a crisis, the nature of which has been obscured by the developing tradition which lacked interest in it even though the marks of it remain.

Lagrange has put his finger on the further development and modification of the tradition. In its "raw" Old Testament and eschatological sense it could not be used. This is best seen in the treatment Matthew or "M" has given the figure of fishing (13: 47–50). He clearly sees it has to do with judgment — but eventually, not immediately; not historically, but apocalyptically. The function of the net (wielded, though Matthew does not say so, by fishermen) is first to gather the fish, all the fish possible, indiscriminately. In dealing with this parable-become-allegory I have previously noted an original parabolic emphasis on the inclusiveness of the operation.[29] Taken alone the parable suggests this. But the purpose of the gathering is sorting and disposition. This

[27] Bundy, for example, makes the story a conversion of "the first third of the apostolic roster into history." Op. cit., p. 72.

[28] With others, Bundy finds (op. cit., p. 72) an echo of I Kings 19:19 ff. But Elijah's call to Elisha, while sudden, is a call to succeed him and we should have to read this into our pericope. This is not what "come after me" means since Jesus is not turning over to them a task he is laying down. The post-resurrection church would so interpret it, which is Bundy's point. My point is that the metaphor in its original sense proved difficult to use in the later situation.

[29] The Jesus of the Parables, pp. 101 ff. Schniewind notes the connection with Matthew and asks whether in Mark Jesus uses the term in the Old Testament sense of the impending (*kommende*) judgment but finds God's judgment completed in the "ministry of the word" (op. cit., p. 51). On the combination of eschatological and ecclesiological interests in Matthew see G. Bornkamm, "Enderwartung und Kirche im Matthäusevangelium," in W. D. Davies and D. Daube (eds.), The Back-

too is the function of the fishermen, there and then, before the fish spoil. But in Matthew this has become the function of others. Angels take the place of the fishers of men and the sorting is deferred to the "end of the age." *Then* will be the fire, the weeping and the gnashing of teeth.

This is part of a peculiarly Matthean pattern but here it is enough to note that while the function of fishermen is still eschatological it has been postponed to an indefinite future. Since angels are to do the sorting conceivably they also wield the net. The human fishermen have been forgotten. The function of Jesus' close associates as agents of the eschatological gathering has been left behind. The considerably later post-resurrection aspects of this treatment are obvious. The existence of it raises the question whether "fishers of men" does not carry as a Biblical phrase a mark of authenticity and of primitiveness which the tradition found inconvenient (and of a kind other than that which Lagrange had in mind).

We can detect further stages in the development and overlaying of the tradition which reveal not so much postponement of the fishing as a conversion of the fisherman's task to a more "genial" form, congenial with the post-pentecostal conception of the Church's mission and, in a sense, less "Biblical."

In the Fourth Gospel the Four are not conspicuously fishermen at all, although the Galilean setting by the lake is retained. When Peter and Andrew, James and John are called they are already disciples of John the Baptist. Nothing is said of their former way of life.[30] The reason for this is not that John is familiar with the Synoptics but that his whole conception of the ministry of Jesus is of one who, by his very presence, effects the judgment (e.g., John 5:22,30; 8:16; 9:39, etc.). It is not until the so-called Appendix of chapter 21 that fishing becomes an occupation of Jesus' followers and then of only seven (perhaps a symbolical number). Were we without the Markan pericope and the Matthean modification of it we would be able to point to the Johannine story as a

---

ground of the New Testament, pp. 222–260. The function of the final separation and its relation to the Church is brought out in this same connection.

[30] The term "fishers" does not appear in John and ἁλιεύω only in the appendix (21:3) in the words of Peter (see below). "Net" does not occur but three different words for fish are used in ch. 21.

sign of the late origin of the whole conception. The possibility of the "incongruity" of Mark 1:17 makes this less certain than it would appear on the surface.

Attempts have been made on the basis of "this is the third time" (John 21:14) to draw this narrative back into the pre-crucifixion Gospel on an analogy with the placing of Luke 5:1–11 and parallel to it. On the other hand C. H. Dodd has shed some light on the form of resurrection narratives.[31] John 21:1–14 bears these marks — the bewildered and ineffective disciples, the appearance of Jesus unrecognized, the subsequent recognition and ensuing meal. In its present form this is clearly a resurrection story though it bears marks of possibly having once had another form and purpose. This would not be unlikely were John 21 a later addition, whether by the evangelist or an editor.

Our concern with it is that it is a fishing scene. The point of the story is that without the risen Christ the disciples can do nothing (cf. John 15:5). They toil but catch no fish. Suddenly Jesus takes charge of the operation and they catch fish, one hundred and fifty-three precisely. There is something to be said for seeing in this exact enumeration a reference to all the species of fish known to the ichthyology of the ancient world.[32] If this be so, the story says that under Christ's guidance the apostles have a mission to gather all mankind. No charge is expressed until in the next story there is added to the missionary ("fishing") work of the Church the pastoral activity of tending the sheep (21:16,17). The earlier implication of a gathering process is retained in John but the element of judgment is neither expressed nor implied. The emphasis lies on the necessity for the presence and guidance of the risen Christ if the primary mission of the apostles is to produce results.[33]

[31] C. H. Dodd, "The Appearances of the Risen Christ," in D. E. Nineham (ed.), Studies in the Gospels, pp. 9–35.

[32] An interpretation which depends on Jerome (cf. Wetstein, ad. loc.), though D. F. Strauss, e.g., has questioned whether Oppian, one of the writers on whom Jerome depends, clearly designates the exact number; see The Life of Jesus, authorized trans. 1865, Vol. II, p. 133. In a later edition (1906, trans. of 4th ed.) Strauss observes, "the ancient legend was fond of occupying its wonder workers with affairs of fishing, as we see in the story related of Pythagoras by Jamblichus and Porphyry" (p. 318).

[33] It is a mistake to interpret Peter's, 'I am going fishing" (21:3) as a despairing decision to return to his former occupation. In the allegorical atmosphere of the

The narrative in Luke 5:1–11 is not to be considered an earlier basis for the Johannine story. Though entirely lacking in verbal correspondence, the Lukan pericope is essentially the same story and bears the same motif. The form in Luke, far from saying that John 21 belongs in the pre-crucifixion Gospel, suggests that the evangelist has included a post-resurrection narrative where it serves his own purposes as a substitute for the Markan call of the Four. Characteristically he has put this fishing story in the framework of Jesus' popular preaching and the words, "I must preach . . . to the other cities also," which in Mark follow the call, here precede it. In Luke's story Simon is put to work, first to provide a place for Jesus to preach and then to fish (v.4). Only then do we learn that fishing has already failed. Simon was first introduced at 4:38 so is already known here where he turns out to be a boat owner. The "we" and "they" of vv. 5 and 6 is not explained for Andrew has not been mentioned and the sons of Zebedee are only in v.10 introduced as Simon's partners. The story ends with a call or commission. The admonition not to fear (v. 10) reads oddly if this is simply a call from a Galilean preacher. The "henceforth" (*ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν*) raises the question, after what (cf. Lagrange above)? "From now on" refers at this point in Luke to no climax and is more likely to refer to v. 8, Peter's recognition of the Lord, than to the declaration in 4:21 (the end of a story moved from its position in the Markan scheme). It refers more clearly to the new task of the called. This new start, Simon's awe and the recognition as Lord clearly designate this as a resurrection narrative modified to fit its new context.[34] Jesus is to

---

passage it is better read as Peter's decision to take the lead in the mission to which he and the others feel themselves called. J. Jeremias has explored the stages by which this became a universal mission and shows that Jesus eliminated the factor of hate from the eschatological expectation (Jesus' Promise to the Nations, Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 24, pp. 40 ff.). The saying in which the Twelve become judges of Israel found in Matthew 19:28 and Luke 22:30 deals with the ultimate function of the fishers in the eschatological denouement, suggesting that this logion belongs to the stage of postponement with Matthew 13:47 ff. Luke has attached the words to others about the Messianic Banquet and made it part of the Last Supper sayings where it has a more appropriate eschatological setting than in Matthew 19. In the diverse settings the service involved differs — in Matthew "following," in Luke, sharing Christ's trials.

[34] R. H. Lightfoot, St. John's Gospel, p. 342, suggests that Luke had to include it here since he has no appearances outside of Jerusalem. This may be a

Peter, "Master" (ἐπιστάτα, v.5) and it is the successful fishing which reveals that Jesus is "Lord" (v.8). There is no connection, as is suggested in Mark, with the inauguration of an eschatological event and the term ἁλεεῖς ἀνθρώπων is avoided in favor of ἀνθρώπους ἔσῃ ζωγρῶν, "you will take men alive." The Lukan narrative reflects the conversion of the eschatological call into a form more congenial to the post-pentecostal Church.

It is necessary to say, then, that the abruptness of the Markan pericope in which Jesus claims to make the four fishermen into "fishers of men" is clearly "dominical," [35] in the sense that it is the Lord who so charges them. It would seem, however, that the Biblical nature of the phrase used (with the evidence of its Qumran retention of judgmental overtones) and its modification in Matthew's apocalyptic and Luke and John's missionary church, suggest that the Lord who calls in Mark is not the risen Christ but the eschatological Lord of a very early stratum of the tradition.[36] The sudden appearance is akin to the post-resurrection stories but lacking here is any recognition scene. Even more clearly it is not the Master who calls them to follow him in the rabbi-disciple relationship or in the Christian-disciple sense, but the eschatological Lord who associates them with himself in his task of proclaiming the impending Kingdom. Their function as "fishers" would be to go where he goes, proclaiming as he goes, and to gather the people for the impending event — eventually to go where he has not gone and themselves to proclaim and gather. All this is set in a framework of eschatological urgency which is here reflected in the sudden call to a function which the Old Testament metaphor makes clear and the Hodayoth show to have retained its sense at

---

contributory cause but the placing is more purposeful than expedient. The call to Peter alone may be another sign of its resurrection provenance.

[35] I would suggest that this term applies to many of the pericopes, some of which have been designated "biographical" and others "epiphany stories." The former element was not in the modern sense a real interest. There was, however, deep interest in the depiction of the Lord "in the days of His flesh." For this combined interest in the man Jesus and the Lord Christ the term "Dominical" seems better than "biographical."

[36] E. Schweizer, op. cit., pp. 88 f., notes the eschatological atmosphere. "But Jesus now in reality goes along this path as the 'eschatological' Righteous One. . . He had taken them with him along this pathway and they were prepared for renunciation for the sake of the dawning Kingdom." Cf. Lohmeyer (op. cit., p. 32) where the eschatological community impinges on time and space.

the time of John the Baptist and Jesus. That the theme is not on the surface followed up in Mark is easily explained and its "conversion" in the other Gospels shows that after the event of the crucifixion-resurrection it was readily displaced by the conception of a different relationship of Jesus to his Church and its leaders.

The developing tradition found little use for the figure beyond the attempt to connect it with the presence of the risen Lord. The point of reference became outmoded and we discern the attempts to adjust it to the task of the Church as that task begins to emerge. I suggest that Matthew's apocalyptic treatment of the parable of the Dragnet is the intervening stage by which the call to eschatological agents was referred to an indeterminate future and at the same time handed over to heavenly agents, the angels. This left, as residue, the term "fishers" fixed in the tradition but detached from its primary meaning. It required, then, a complete change from the Biblical and contemporary sense of the metaphor to make it apply to the benevolent task of the Christian ministry not incompatible with the pastoral task of tending sheep. It may, incidentally, suggest that some necessary eschatological aspect of the ministry has been lost from our conception of it.[37]

The "epiphany" character of the Markan pericope may have two explanations. It is either a resurrection-story of the Risen Christ who calls, which is true of the Lukan and Johannine stories, but of which the Markan account shows little sign beyond an abruptness in itself susceptible of another explanation. Or it is the eschatological Lord who calls. This fits the Markan development and with it the figure used is entirely consistent. Whether it is a dogmatic construction of the early Church (cf. Lohmeyer) depends upon many other considerations in which a proper understanding of this figure would itself be a factor. That it occupies

[37] Schniewind assumes that the metaphor would take the hearers by surprise and would arouse them by its relation to their occupation. The possibility of its direct application in the Biblical sense as a fulfillment passes over into the "ministry of the Word" (*Dienst am Wort*), op. cit., p. 51. This expression has connotations which better fit the Johannine and Lukan forms and can only receive the force Jesus gave to "fishers of men" if the original call to an eschatological task is understood.

There is one place in which the figure of sheep is used eschatologically, the difficult passage Matthew 25:31–46. It belongs in the same transitional category as the Dragnet, the Son of Man appears as King rather than shepherd, and the apostles do not appear in any capacity.

a place in a substratum which seemed inconvenient to the developing thought-forms of the Church is clear. That its primitive nature suggests something true in the history of the Jesus who moved about Galilee should not be dismissed out of hand. There are other marks of a Galilean crisis (note the apparent lack of connections with the "Mission of the Twelve" at Mark 6:7–13, especially the obviously inserted v. 14b). Into such a crisis an understanding of the original Biblical meaning of "fishers of men" appears readily to fit — especially by reason of its transient place in the Gospel tradition. Perhaps we approach a point at which the Markan dogma and the facts of history bear a closer relation than has recently been supposed, though just what that relation is it may never be possible to define in so many words.

NEO-LATIN VERSE-TRANSLATIONS OF THE BIBLE

Johannes Gaertner recently published an article on Latin verse-translations of Psalms in which he described at length the history of a "buried and forgotten literary genre" that reached the height of its popularity during the sixteenth century.[1] Psalms, however, was not the only book of the Bible to find itself arrayed in this curious dress, and one may accordingly add a bibliographical footnote to Professor Gaertner's article by noting some of the most important Latin verse-translations of individual books [2] and also of large portions of the Bible,[3] almost invariably written by Germans or Dutchmen: the practice seems to have been largely a phenomenon of the northern Protestant reformation.

So far as I have been able to discover (and the present chaotic state of Neo-Latin bibliography prevents certainty here as elsewhere) no Renaissance Latin poet ever translated the Bible from Genesis to Revelation, although one should add that such a task would not have been beyond either the abilities or the industry of many a fifteenth- or sixteenth-century humanist one could name.[4] Nevertheless, there were many who constructed, as an *aide-mémoire*, versified outlines of the whole Bible, arranged by books or even by chapters; the most common verse-medium was either hexameters or the elegiac couplet, although iambics, oddly enough, did appear now and then. That the purpose

[1] Harvard Theological Review XLIX (1956), 271–305. Of course these "translations" were not based on the original Hebrew or Greek texts but on the Latin prose of the Vulgate; for true Latin verse-translation from a different language, cf. C. M. Piastra "Nota sulle versioni latine della Divina Commedia" Aevum XXX (1956), 267–271, and for Latin prose- and verse-translations from many European vernaculars cf. the present writer's articles in Phoenix VIII (1954), 64–70 and Studies in the Renaissance (Publications of the Renaissance Society of America) I (1954), 120–156.

[2] This note will ignore individual brief Neo-Latin poems (like Peter de Fransz's first three eclogues) that are merely poetic modifications of brief, well-known passages of Scripture (in these three instances, the Song of Moses, Psalm 118, and the Nativity-story).

[3] A complete version of the Bible in Ciceronian Latin prose was published at Basel in 1551 by Sébastien Châteillon; presumably this translation would have commended itself to Pietro Bembo, who advised Giacopo Sadoleto against the rubbish (*nugae*) of St. Jerome's Vulgate.

[4] One might instance Mantuanus (Giovanni Battista Spagnuoli) and Antonio Geraldini, both religious poets and both noted for the extreme rapidity of their composition of Latin verse: Mantuan, probably the most voluminous Neo-Latin poet who ever put pen to paper, wrote the 2102 lines of part II of the Parthenicae — on St. Catherine of Alexandria — in forty days, merely to pass the time during an enforced summer vacation; Geraldini wrote the 1155 lines of his twelve devotional eclogues in 45 days.

actually was mnemonic is clear from some of the titles: Memoriale Biblicum was the name chosen by Petrus de Rosenheim (Strassburg, 1544), Matthias Freyen (Herborn, 1608), Matthias Martinius (Martini; Bremen, 1615), and doubtless many others of whom I am unaware. The purpose is equally clear in the titles of Johann Lauterbach's Enchiridion veteris et novi Testamenti (Frankfurt, 1573), Simeon Salichius' Monosticha characteristica (Magdeburg, 1613), Benjamin Luppius' Medulla sacrosanctae Scripturae (Halle, 1620), Johann Fischer's Summaria Biblica (Herborn, 1623), and Jacob Zückwolf's elaborate Chronographiae sacrae utriusque Testamenti libri quinque (Frankfurt, 1594).[5]

Translations of individual books of the Old Testament were extremely common between about 1550 and 1650, and usually took the form of extended paraphrases in epic style: these works were produced, as Philip Melanchthon said of the version of Psalms written by that friend of Luther and Erasmus, Helius Eobanus Hessus, *ad pietatem, et ad formanda iudicia studiosae iuventutis, deinde etiam ad incitandas generosas naturas ad studium poetices*; just so had Juvencus, as early as the fourth century, written a harmony of the Gospels (Historia evangelica) in Latin verse "to reform, instruct, and delight" the student. Naturally it was the historical books of the Old Testament that lent themselves most readily to epic treatment, but Genesis and Exodus were also so metamorphosed: the Josephias of Paul Didymus (i.e., Zwilling; Jena, 1573) is despite the name, an epic version of all Genesis and Ulrich Bollinger's Moseïdes (Tübingen, 1603), actually extends to nine books of fairly Virgilian hexameters[6] paraphrasing Exodus. So far as I am aware, no one — understandably enough — ever attempted Leviticus, Numbers, or Deuteronomy, although Lesser does speak of an unpublished elegiac version of the entire Pentateuch by Petrus de Riga.

Among versions of the historical books one of the most elaborate is Caspar Sturm's Josua (Frankfort, 1622), which comprised no less than fifteen books of overblown hexameters: in its day it may well have had a fair number of readers, to judge from the frequency of the book's

[5] We may cite further such outlines, variously entitled, by Rudolf Walter (Zürich, 1543), Johannes Vulteius (Marburg, 1587), Andreas Margiletus (Schmalkalden, 1599), Sébastien Chély (Brunswick, 1603), and Caspar Eurymachaera (Breitschwert; Leipzig, 1615), as well as an unpublished outline of most books by the indefatigable Petrus de Riga mentioned by Friedrich Christian Lesser in his Epistula gratulatoria de poetis latinis Biblicis (Göttingen, 1752).

[6] The Historiae primi mundi libri sex ([Brunswick?] 1589) of Melchior Neofanius (Neukirchen) is more Ovidian than Virgilian in tone, diction, and rhythm; the first book in particular (on the Creation) owes much to the Metamorphoses.

recurrence in the printed catalogues of public and private libraries; my own hasty examination of two books leads me to suspect that this worthy effort has slumbered undisturbed since at least 1700. Of Judges there seems to be no known version save an unpublished (elegiac?) paraphrase by Petrus de Riga. There are at least two versions of Ruth: I have not seen that by Jacobus Zovitius,[7] published at Antwerp in 1532, but I have seen and read the elegiac paraphrase published by the Jesuit Johann Bissel in his miscellany called Aestiva (Augsburg, 1644): this is an excellent piece of writing and is one of the very few of these poems worth reading for its own sake. No printed version of the books of Samuel seems to exist; but Lesser speaks of an unpublished translation by Petrus de Riga, written in his usual elegiacs. The same poet also composed an elegiac paraphrase of the books of Kings; of these books there are at least three printed versions, all entitled Historia regum Israelitarum, published by Hieronymus Osius (Wittenberg, 1559), Willelmus Actius (Strassburg, 1604), and John Johnston (Frankfurt, 1613). Petrus de Riga wrote, but never published, an elegiac version of the books of Chronicles (Lesser): the work must have circulated widely in manuscript, for there are many copies in European, and especially in German, libraries. In any case, this appears to be the only version; the same is true of the same poet's elegiac paraphrases of Ezra and Nehemiah. Of Esther there is an hexameter paraphrase by Caspar von Barth in his Adversaria (Frankfurt, 1624) and an elegiac version by one Vollockius (Giessen, 1619; *non vidi*).

In the versions of Job one encounters two quite well-known Scottish Neo-Latin poets: Patrick Adamson in his Metaphrasis poetica Iobi (London, 1650) and the ubiquitous William Hog in Paraphrasis poetica in Iobum (London, 1683), both using hexameters — good hexameters, at that.[8]

Translations of Psalms, usually entitled Cithara Davidica, Paraphrasis poetica Psalmorum, or the like, are of course common: versions of the entire 150 appear in a veritable flood between 1550 and 1650;

[7] Also called Drischarus and a Trituribus.

[8] Adamson's briefer poems are published (as are those of Johnston, mentioned later) in volume one of Delitiae poetarum Scotorum (Amsterdam, 1637); Hog is best known for his Latin versions of Milton: Paraphrasis poetica in tria Johannis Miltoni . . . poemata, viz. Paradisum amissum, Paradisum recuperatum, et Samson Agonistem (London, 1690); Comoedia (i.e., Comus) Joannis Miltoni . . . paraphrastice reddita (London, 1698); Paraphrasis latina in duo poemata, quorum alterum a Miltono (i.e., Lycidas), alterum a Clievelando anglice scriptum fuit (London, 1694). There is an amusing anecdote about Hog's translation of Paradise Lost in the introduction to T. R. Glover's Latin translation (Cambridge [Heffer], 1922) of A Child's Garden of Verses, pp. ix–xi.

these were not only written and published but bought and read, as is clear from the publishing history of Helius Eobanus Hessus' elegiac paraphrase (for which Erasmus dubbed him *Ovidius Christianus* as he had earlier called Mantuan *Vergilius Christianus* for his eclogues and religious epics and epyllia), which appeared in at least eleven editions.[9] The metres used in versions of Psalms are the heroic hexameter, Horatian lyric metres [10] (especially Alcaics and Sapphics, as in George Buchanan's justly famous version [Paris, 1566, and reprinted many times] [11]), elegiacs, and, once at least, hendecasyllabics,[12] by Radulphus Lemannus (Zürich, ca. 1608).

Translations and paraphrases of Proverbs (the elegiac metre is normally used and is most appropriate) begin with that of Alvaro Gomez, Prior of St. Nicholas at Lisbon (Basel, 1538) and continue to appear every decade or so [13] until at least 1717. Versions of Ecclesiastes were equally popular [14] as were others of the Song of Solomon.[15]

The prophetical books are respectably represented, but understandably proved more intractable and less attractive than historical, gnomic, and lyric books: there appear to be only two complete versions of, for

[9] Leipzig, 1546, 1557, 1562, 1567, 1575, 1578, 1584, 1591, 1597, and 1600; Paris, 1549.

[10] Christian Egenolf published a lyric version not only of Psalms but also of Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Solomon in his Epodon libri (Frankfurt, 1565).

[11] Strassburg, 1566, Antwerp, 1567, Morsee (Morges), 1581, Antwerp, 1582, Herborn, 1588, Geneva, 1590, etc.

[12] The choice of metre is unusual, but not nearly so astonishing as its use in a light-hearted epitaph (sixteenth-century) in the church at Burford in Oxfordshire.

[13] For example, versions (usually entitled Proverbia Solomonis) by Hartmann Schopper (Dillingen, 1565), Friedrich Dedekind (Magdeburg, 1574), Fridericus Papa (Magdeburg, 1578), Pantaleon Candidus (Weiss; Strassburg, 1598), Radulphus Lemannus (Ethica Christiana; Zürich, 1608), Martin Nessel (Bremen, 1653), and Joachim Breithaupt (Magdeburg, 1717).

[14] For instance, those of Caspar Schütz (Wittenberg, 1540), Helius Eobanus Hessus (published with his Psalter; cf. footnote 8 above), Radulphus Lemannus (Basel, 1560), Johannes Vivianus (Antwerp, 1580), Johann Klaj the Elder (Leipzig, 1583), Georgius Remius or Remus in his Spicilegia (Siegen, 1596), Marcus Hassaeus (Rostock, 1589), Jacques Lect in his Sylvae (Zürich, 1609), Laurent Lebrun (Paris, 1653), and Johannes Maurus (Theatrum universale vanitatis; Paris, 1668). The version by Lebrun is particularly skilful; this Jesuit was an excellent Neo-Latin minor poet: his best work appears in his eclogues and his descriptions (modelled on Ovid's Epistulae ex Ponto) of Canada and the Hurons.

[15] For instance, those of Willeram, Abbot of Eberg (Hagenau, 1528), Nicholas Henning ([n.p.], 1571), anonymous (Frankfurt, 1574), Théodore de Bèze (Geneva, 1584), François de Monceaux in his Bucolica sacra (Paris, 1587), Petrus Bellaeus (Geneva, 1590), Tobias Trachelius in his Poemata (Leipzig, 1596), another anonymous writer (Zürich, 1598), Paulus Merula (Leyden, 1598), Adam Sieber (Wittenberg, 1609), Johann Burmeister (Goslar, 1614), Arthur Johnston in his excellent version of Psalms (Mittelburg, 1642), and Martin Nessel (Bremen, 1658).

instance, Isaiah — an elegiac paraphrase by Martin Moeller (Hamburg, 1581) and a translation into hexameters by Jean Charpentier (Paris, 1589). Jeremiah, on the other hand, appears in a remarkably large number of translations,[16] and there is at least one complete verse-translation of all twelve minor prophets by no less outstanding a figure than Jacques Auguste de Thou,[17] librarian of the Bibliothèque Royale and author of the enormous but even so unfinished Latin history of France.[18] Other versions of the minor prophets are, however, seldom met and of little interest: Joel, by Johann Stigel, in volume one of his Opera poetica (Jena, 1566–1572); Amos, by Theodor Reysmann (Strassburg, 1544); Micah and also Zachariah, by Conrad Rittershuis (Leipzig, 1598). But Jonah appeared in at least seven versions: those by Johann Hoffmann (constructed as that most dismal of all literary forms, the cento — in this case, as so often, drawn from the poems of the unfortunate Virgil; [Leipzig?], 1586), Daniel Saxo (lyric; Wittenberg, [n.d.]), Wilhelm Alard (Lippe, 1602), David Lipsius (lyric; Mecklenberg, 1618), Nicolaus Kunckel (elegiac; Helmstadt, 1619), Georg Eberhard Schreiner (Halle, 1629), and Hugo Grotius in his Sylvae (Leyden, 1639).

In translations of the Apocrypha an interesting development is the appearance of dramas in elegiac form: [19] Cornelius Schonaeus produced a Tobias comicus [20] (Strassburg, 1583), Xystus Betuleius (i.e., Sixt Birck) a Iudith comica [21] (Strassburg, 1584), and Nicolaus Frischlin a

[16] Those, for example, by Johannes Cornerus (elegiac; Tübingen, 1572), Joachim Camerarius (Leipzig, 1573), Abraham Loescher (Basel, 1581), Jacobus Latomus the Younger (Antwerp, 1587), Jean Jacquemot (lyric; Geneva, 1591), Otto Henricus Moenius (Hamburg, 1616), Caspar Sanctius (Sanchez, of Cienpoçuelos; Leyden, 1618), and Patrick Adamson (London, 1619).

[17] Iacobi Augusti Thuani As fatidicus (Amberg, 1604).

[18] Historiae sui temporis in 138 books (Frankfurt, 1628): for some concise critical comment, cf. La grande encyclopédie vol. 30, p. 40. Scholars are not so ready nowadays to regard the Neo-Latin historians as Livian pedants: see B. L. Ullman "Leonardo Bruni and Humanistic Historiography" in Studies in the Italian Renaissance (Rome, 1955), pp. 321–344; cf. also Beatrice R. Reynolds "Latin Historiography: A Survey, 1400–1600" Studies in the Renaissance II (1955), 7–66.

[19] Elegiac Latin plays were no new thing; earlier examples are discussed in Gustave Cohen, La comédie latine du moyen âge (Paris, 1931).

[20] This does not mean "comic" or "burlesqued": on the meanings that *comicus* and *comoedia* had already acquired in mediaeval Latin cf. J. W. H. Atkins, English Literary Criticism: The Medieval Phase (Cambridge, 1943), p. 106. Other, and more conventional, versions of Tobias are by Matthias Vindocinensis, Louis IX's prime minister (elegiac; Lyon, 1505) and Johann Zorn (Erfurt, 1565).

[21] Conventional translations of Judith are by Nicolaus Ludwig (Leipzig, 1569), Michael Hempel (elegiac; Wittenberg, 1594), and Jacobus Cauphillus (James Calfhill, *floruit* 1560; Altdorf, 1699).

Susanna comica [22] (Strassburg, 1595). There can be little doubt that these plays were actually presented by young students: not only was there a flourishing and extensive adult drama (tragedy, melodrama, and comedy) in Neo-Latin literature,[23] there were also scores of less exalted productions intended to improve students' morality and Latinity alike. As for the rest of the Apocrypha, we can point to several versions of the Wisdom of Jesus of Sirach,[24] and naturally an epic version of Maccabees appears — Heinrich Walter's Iudas Maccabaeus (Herborn, 1604).

One would have expected that translations of parts, at least, of the New Testament would have abounded from earliest Renaissance times to latest Baroque, yet they are remarkably few. No poet, to my knowledge, ever ventured upon a translation of the entire corpus; but a very considerable number of writers did have the hardihood to attempt a narrative based on a harmony of the whole of the Evangels: Jacobus Andreas (Cologne, 1595) was the most pious Neo-Latinist, I believe, to produce an epic version of the birth, ministry, death, and resurrection of Christ; the most wearisome, I am equally convinced, must have been Alexander Ross (thirteen books; Rotterdam, 1653). The two most famous poems of this class are the De partu virginis (Naples, 1526) of Giacopo Sannazaro and the Christias (Cremona, 1535, with many, many reprints in the sixteenth, seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries) of Marco Girolamo Vida of Cremona, works which pass far beyond mere paraphrase: these two poems (the latter of which, as is well-known, considerably influenced John Milton) are major achievements, the work of men of learning, imagination, and feeling, in every way worth reading for their own sake.

The letters of the New Testament attracted a fair number of translators: François Bonade produced a complete version of the epistles of St. Paul (Basel, 1537) as did Johann Rothe (Leipzig, 1568), and Johann Fiedler translated Ephesians alone (Dresden, 1653); Johann Habercock translated the epistles of Peter (Munich, 1566) as did Nicolaus Selnecker (Jena, 1567). And as a final example we can refer to Johann Conrad Rhumel the Elder's version of Revelation (Nürnberg, 1619).

[22] A conventional version of Susanna is by Nicholas Henning (elegiac; [n.p.], 1571), published with his version of the Song of Solomon.

[23] Cf. Leicester Bradner, "The Latin Drama of the Renaissance," Studies in the Renaissance IV (1957), 31–70, in which this branch of the literature is traced from 1314 to 1640.

[24] Those by Johann Lorich (elegiac; Ingolstadt, 1544), Johannes Seccervitius

Every literature contains excellent, good, fair, and atrocious; this is as true of Neo-Latin literature as of any other, and equally true within its individual genres: among the two hundred (and more) Latin pastoral poets who flourished between 1300 and 1700 we can pass from the zenith of elegance to the absolute nadir of frigidity.[25] Here, too, we can find not only the missionary vehemence and excitement of the close of the sixth book of Vida's Christiad but also some German schoolmaster's Alcaic Psalter that is as uncompromisingly flat and in parts as comically unpoetic as many stanzas of the Scottish Metrical Psalms and Paraphrases:

By Babel's streams we sat and wept
  When Sion we thought on;
In midst whereof we hang'd our harps
  The willow-trees upon;

For there a song requirèd they,
  Who did us captive bring:
Our spoilers call'd for mirth, and said,
  A song of Sion sing . . . .

W. Leonard Grant

University of British Columbia,
Vancouver, Canada.

(elegiac; Basel, 1556), Heinrich Hermann (Leipzig, 1586), and Nicolaus Siegfried (elegiac; Jena, 1604).

[25] The reader will gain some idea of the remarkable extent of the vogue of Neo-Latin pastoral from five essays of mine in Phoenix IX (1955), 19–26; Studies in Philology LIII (1956), 429–451 and LIV (1957), 481–497; Studies in the Renaissance IV (1957), 71–100; and Medievalia et Humanistica XI (1957), 94–98. In addition to these and to the surveys referred to above in footnotes 1 (last article mentioned), 16, and 21 that bring to our attention three other aspects of the now gradually emerging history of Neo-Latin literature, note further Leicester Bradner, "Neo-Latin Epigram in Italy in the Fifteenth Century," Medievalia et Humanistica VIII (1954), 62–70 and D. F. S. Thomson, "The Latin Epigram in Scotland: The Sixteenth Century," Phoenix XI (1957), 63–78.

BOOKS RECEIVED

THE COUNCIL OF FLORENCE. *By Joseph Gill.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1959. 452p.

THE TRANSCENDENTALIST MINISTERS. *By William R. Hutchison.* New Haven, Yale University Press, 1959. 240p.

OFFICIUM HEBDOMADAE SANCTAE ET OCTAVAE PASCHAE CUM CANTU: iuxta Ordinem Breviarii Missalis et Pontificalis Romani. Editio Typica. Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis [1959] xxiii, 736, 31p.

THE SYMPATHETIC ALIEN. *By J. Mitchell Morse.* New York University Press, 1959. 169p.

DIE MESSE ALS OPFER DER KIRCHE: die Lehre Fruehmittelalterlicher Autoren ueber das Eucharistische Opfer; *von Dr. P. Raphael Schulte* . . . Muenster, Westfalen, Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung [1959] xv, 198p. Liturgiewissenschaftliche Quellen und Forschungen, Heft 35)